arXiv:1504.07042v3 [math.RT] 23 Jul 2015

Irreducible quantum group modules with finite dimensional weight spaces. I

Dennis Hasselstrøm Pedersen

Abstract

In this paper we classify all simple weight modules for a quantum group U_q at a complex odd root of unity q when the Lie algebra is not of type G_2. By a weight module we mean a finitely generated U_q-module which has finite dimensional weight spaces and is a sum of those. Our approach follows the procedures used by S. Fernando [Fer90] and O. Mathieu [Mat00] to solve the corresponding problem for semisimple complex Lie algebras.

1 Introduction and notation

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple complex Lie algebra not of type G_2. Let $q \in \mathbb{C}$ be a nonzero element and let $U_q := U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantum group over $\mathbb{C}$ with q as the quantum parameter (defined below). We want to classify all simple weight modules for U_q. In the papers [Fer90] and [Mat00] this is done for $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Fernando proves in the paper [Fer90] that the classification of simple $\mathfrak{g}$ weight modules essentially boils down to classifying two classes of simple modules: The finite dimensional simple modules and the so called 'torsion free' simple modules. The classification of finite dimensional modules is well known in the classical case (as well as in the quantum group case) so the remaining problem is to classify the torsion free simple modules. Olivier Mathieu classifies these in the classical case in [Mat00]. The classification uses the concept of $\mathfrak{g}$ coherent families which are huge $\mathfrak{g}$ modules with weight vectors for every possible weight, see [Mat00, Section 4]. Mathieu shows that every torsion free simple module is a submodule of a unique irreducible semisimple coherent family and each of these irreducible semisimple coherent families contains a so-called admissible simple highest weight module as well. This reduces the classification to the classification of admissible simple highest weight modules.

1.1 Main results

In this paper we will first carry out the reduction done by Fernando to the quantum group case for q a non-root-of-unity and q an odd root of unity. Then we carry out the classification of torsion free simple module in the root of unity case. The corresponding classification of torsion free simple modules for generic q turns out to be much harder. We leave this to a subsequent paper [Ped15a].

We will follow closely the methods described in the two above mentioned papers. Many of the results can be directly translated from the classical case but in several cases we have to approach the problem a little differently. One of the first differences we encounter is the fact that in [Fer90] concepts are defined by using the root system without first choosing a base. Then later a base is chosen in an appropiate way. In the quantum group case we define the quantized enveloping algebra by first choosing a base of the root system and then defining the simple root vectors E_α, F_α, etc. This means that we can't later change the basis like in [Fer90]. The solution is to consider 'twists' of modules by Weyl group elements cf. definition 2.1. Another difference is the fact that we do not a priori have root vectors E_β for any positive root β unless β is simple. Root vectors can be constructed but the construction involves a choice of a reduced expression for the longest element of the Weyl group w_0. The root vectors constructed depend on this choice. So if we want to use root vectors to define our terms we should prove that our definitions are independent of the choice of the root vectors. Once the root vectors are defined we continue like in the classical case with some differences. Notably the proof of Proposition 2.11 is different. Here we reduce the problem to rank 2 calculations in the quantized enveloping algebra. This is also the main reason we exclude $\mathfrak{g}$ of type G_2 in this paper.

In the root of unity case the classification of simple weight modules reduces completely to the classical case as seen in Section 5. We use the same procedure as in [Mat00] to reduce the problem to classifying coherent families and then we show that all irreducible coherent families in the root of unity case can be constructed via classical $\mathfrak{g}$ coherent families.

1.2 Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor Henning H. Andersen for great supervision and many helpful comments and discussions and Jacob Greenstein for introducing me to this problem when I was visiting him at UC Riverside in the fall of 2013. The authors research was supported by the center of excellence grant 'Center for Quantum Geometry of Moduli Spaces' from the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF95).

1.3 Notation

We will fix some notation: We denote by $\mathfrak{g}$ a fixed simple Lie algebra over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. We assume $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type G_2 to avoid unpleasant computations.

Fix a triangular decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$: Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a maximal toral subalgebra and let $\Phi \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the roots of $\mathfrak{g}$ relative to $\mathfrak{h}$. Choose a simple system of roots $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subset \Phi$. Let Φ^+ (resp. Φ^-) be the positive (resp. negative) roots. Let $\mathfrak{g}^\pm$ be the positive and negative part of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to the simple system Π. So $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^+$. Let W be the Weyl group generated by the simple reflections $s_i := s_{\alpha_i}$. For a $w \in W$ let $l(w)$ be the length of W i.e. the smallest amount of simple reflections such that $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{l(w)}}$. Let $(\cdot|\cdot)$ be a standard W-invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ and $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = \frac{2(\alpha|\beta)}{(\beta|\beta)}$. Since $(\cdot|\cdot)$ is standard we have $(\alpha|\alpha) = 2$ for any short root $\alpha \in \Phi$. Let $Q = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ denote the root lattice and $\Lambda = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ the integral lattice where $\omega_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ are the fundamental weights defined by $(\omega_i|\alpha_j) = \delta_{ij}$.

Let $U_v = U_v(\mathfrak{g})$ be the corresponding quantized enveloping algebra defined over $\mathbb{Q}(v)$ as defined in [Jan96] with generators $E_\alpha, F_\alpha, K_\alpha^{\pm 1}$, $\alpha \in \Pi$ and certain relations which can be found in Chapter 4 of [Jan96]. We define $v_\alpha = v^{(\alpha|\alpha)/2}$ (i.e. $v_\alpha = v$ if α is a short root and $v_\alpha = v^2$ if α is a long root) and for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $[n]_v = \frac{v^n - v^{-n}}{v - v^{-1}}$. Let $[n]_\alpha := [n]_{v_\alpha} = \frac{v_\alpha^n - v_\alpha^{-n}}{v_\alpha - v_\alpha^{-1}}$. We omit the subscripts when it is clear from the context. For later use we also define the quantum binomial coefficients: For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} a \\ r \end{bmatrix}_v = \frac{[a][a-1]\cdots[a-r+1]}{[r]!}$$

where $[r]! := [r][r-1]\cdots[2][1]$. Let $A = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ and let U_A be Lusztigs A-form defined in [Lus90], i.e. the A subalgebra generated by the divided powers $E_\alpha^{(n)} := \frac{1}{[n]_\alpha!} E_\alpha^n$, $F_\alpha^{(n)} := \frac{1}{[n]_\alpha!} F_\alpha^n$ and $K_\alpha^{\pm 1}$, $\alpha \in \Pi$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{C}$ be a nonzero complex number and set $U_q = U_A \otimes_A \mathbb{C}_q$ where $\mathbb{C}_q$ is the A-module equal to $\mathbb{C}$ as a vector space where v is sent to q. In the following sections we will distinguish between whether q is a root of unity or not.

We have a triangular decomposition of Lusztigs A-form $U_A = U_A^- \otimes U_A^0 \otimes U_A^+$ with U_A^- the A subalgebra generated by $\{F_\alpha^{(n)} | \alpha \in \Pi, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in U_A, U_A^+ the A subalgebra generated by $\{E_\alpha^{(n)} | \alpha \in \Pi, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in U_A and U_A^0 the A subalgebra generated by $\{K_\alpha^{\pm 1}, \begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c \\ r \end{bmatrix} | \alpha \in \Pi, c \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in U_A where

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c \\ r \end{bmatrix} := \prod_{j=1}^{r} \frac{K_\alpha v_\alpha^{c+1-j} - K_\alpha^{-1} v_\alpha^{-c-1+j}}{v_\alpha^j - v_\alpha^{-j}}.$$

For later use we also define $[K_\alpha; r] = \begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. We have the corresponding triangular decomposition of U_q: $U_q = U_q^- \otimes U_q^0 \otimes U_q^+$ with $U_q^\pm = U_A^\pm \otimes_A \mathbb{C}_q$ and $U_q^0 = U_A^0 \otimes_A \mathbb{C}_q$.

For a $q \in \mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C} \backslash \{0\}$ define $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ r \end{bmatrix}_q$ as the image of $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ r \end{bmatrix}_v$ in $\mathbb{C}$. We will omit the subscript from the notation when it is clear from the context. We define $q_\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $[n]_\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ as the image of $v_\beta \in A$ and $[n]_\beta \in A$, respectively abusing notation. Similarly, we will abuse notation and write $\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c \\ r \end{bmatrix}$ also for the image of $\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c \\ r \end{bmatrix} \in U_A$ in U_q. Define for $\mu \in Q$, $K_\mu = \prod_{i=1}^n K_{\alpha_i}^{a_i}$ if $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

There is a braid group action on U_v which we will describe now. We use the definition from [Jan96, Chapter 8]. The definition is slightly different from the original in [Lus90, Theorem 3.1] (see [Jan96, Warning 8.14]). For each simple reflection s_i there is a braid operator that we will denote by T_{s_i} satisfying the following: $T_{s_i} : U_v \to U_v$ is a $\mathbb{Q}(v)$ automorphism and for $i \neq j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{s_i}(K_\mu) =& K_{s_i(\mu)} \\ T_{s_i}(E_{\alpha_i}) =& - F_{\alpha_i} K_{\alpha_i} \\ T_{s_i}(F_{\alpha_i}) =& - K_{\alpha_i}^{-1} E_{\alpha_i} \\ T_{s_i}(E_{\alpha_j}) =& \sum_{i=0}^{-\langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle} (-1)^i v_{\alpha_i}^{-i} E_{\alpha_i}^{(r-i)} E_{\alpha_j} E_{\alpha_i}^{(i)} \\ T_{s_i}(F_{\alpha_j}) =& \sum_{i=0}^{-\langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle} (-1)^i v_{\alpha_i}^{i} F_{\alpha_i}^{(i)} F_{\alpha_j} F_{\alpha_i}^{(r-i)}. \end{aligned}$$

The inverse $T_{s_i}^{-1}$ is given by conjugating with the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra anti-automorphism

Ψ from [Lus90, section 1.1] defined as follows:

$$\Psi(E_{\alpha_i}) = E_{\alpha_i}, \quad \Psi(F_{\alpha_i}) = F_{\alpha_i}, \quad \Psi(K_{\alpha_i}) = K_{\alpha_i}^{-1}, \quad \Psi(v) = v.$$

The braid operators T_{s_i} satisfy braid relations so we can define T_w for any $w \in W$: Choose a reduced expression of w: $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_n}$. Then $T_w = T_{s_{i_1}} \cdots T_{s_{i_n}}$ is independent of the chosen reduced expression by [Lus90, Theorem 3.2]. We have $T_w(K_\mu) = K_{w(\mu)}$. Furthermore T_w restricts to an automorphism $T_w : U_A \to U_A$.

Let w_0 be the longest element in W and let $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_N}$ be a reduced expression of w_0. We define root vectors E_β and F_β for any $\beta \in \Phi^+$ by the following: First of all set

$$\beta_j = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{j-1}}(\alpha_{i_j}), \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

Then $\Phi^+ = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_N\}$. Set

$$E_{\beta_j} = T_{s_{i_1}} \cdots T_{s_{i_{j-1}}}(E_{\alpha_{i_j}})$$

and

$$F_{\beta_j} = T_{s_{i_1}} \cdots T_{s_{i_{j-1}}}(F_{\alpha_{i_j}}).$$

In this way we have defined root vectors for each $\beta \in \Phi^+$. These root vectors depend on the reduced expression chosen for w_0 above. For a different reduced expression we might get different root vectors. It is a fact that if $\beta \in \Pi$ then the root vectors E_β and F_β defined above are the same as the generators with the same notation (cf. e.g. [Jan96, Proposition 8.20]) so the notation is not ambigious in this case. By "Let E_β be a root vector" we just mean a root vector constructed as above for some reduced expression of w_0.

1.4 Basic definitions

Definition 1.1 *Let M be a U_q-module and $\lambda : U_q^0 \to \mathbb{C}$ a character (i.e. an algebra homomorphism into $\mathbb{C}$). Then the weight space M_λ is defined as*

$$M_\lambda = \{m \in M | \forall u \in U_q^0, um = \lambda(u)m\}.$$

Let X denote the set of characters of U_q^0. Let $\operatorname{wt} M$ denote all the weights of M, i.e. $\operatorname{wt} M = \{\lambda \in X | M_\lambda \neq 0\}$. If q is not a root of unity we define for $\mu \in \Lambda$ the character q^μ by $q^\mu(K_\alpha) = q^{(\mu|\alpha)}$ for any $\alpha \in \Pi$. We also define $q_\beta^\mu = q^{\frac{(\beta|\beta)}{2}\mu}$. We say that M only has integral weights if $\mu(K_\alpha) \in \pm q_\alpha^{\mathbb{Z}}$ for any $\alpha \in \Pi$, $\mu \in \operatorname{wt} M$.

If q is not a root of unity then U_q^0 is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[X_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$ and X can be identified with $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ by sending $\mu \in X$ to $(\mu(K_{\alpha_1}), \ldots, \mu(K_{\alpha_n}))$. When q is a root of unity the situation is a bit more complex. We will show later that when q is a root of unity X can be identified with $S \times \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$ where S is the set of homomorphisms $Q \to \{\pm 1\}$ and Λ_l is a finite set depending on the order l of the root of unity. There is an action of W on X. For $\lambda \in X$ define $w\lambda$ by

$$(w\lambda)(u) = \lambda(T_{w^{-1}}(u)).$$

Note that $wq^\mu = q^{w(\mu)}$.

Definition 1.2 *Let M be a U_q-module and $w \in W$. Define the twisted module ${}^{w}M$ by the following:*

As a vector space ${}^{w}M = M$ but the action is given by twisting with w^{-1}: For $m \in {}^{w}M$ and $u \in U_q$:

$$u \cdot m = T_{w^{-1}}(u)m.$$

We also define ${}^{\overline{w}}M$ to be the inverse twist, i.e. for $m \in {}^{\overline{w}}M$, $u \in U_q$:

$$u \cdot m = T_{w^{-1}}^{-1}(u)m.$$

Hence for any U_q-module M, ${}^{\overline{w}}({}^{w}M) = M = {}^{w}({}^{\overline{w}}M)$.

Note that $\operatorname{wt} {}^{w}M = w(\operatorname{wt} M)$ and that ${}^{w}({}^{w'}M) \cong {}^{ww'}M$ for $w, w' \in W$ with $l(ww') = l(w) + l(w')$ because the braid operators T_w satisfy braid relations. Also ${}^{\overline{w}}({}^{\overline{w'}}M) \cong {}^{\overline{w'w}}M$.

Definition 1.3 *We define the category $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$ as the full subcategory of $U_q - \mathrm{Mod}$ such that for every $M \in \mathcal{F}$ we have*

1. *M is finitely generated as a U_q-module.*
2. *$M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X} M_\lambda$ and $\dim M_\lambda < \infty$.*

Note that the assignment $M \mapsto {}^{w}M$ is an endofunctor on $\mathcal{F}$ (in fact an auto-equivalence).

The goal of this paper is to classify all the simple modules in $\mathcal{F}$ in the case where $q \in \mathbb{C}$ is a root of unity. Our first step is a reduction to so called torsion free simple modules, see Definition 2.8. This reduction actually works for generic q as well and we treat that case first, see Section 2. Then in Section 3 we prove the corresponding reduction when q is a root of 1. To handle the torsion free simple modules we need some detailed calculations - found in [Ped15b] and recalled in Section 4 - on the commutation relations among quantum root vectors. Then we prove the classification of torsion free simple modules in Section 5 and Section 6. The classification for generic q turns out to be somewhat harder and will be the subject of a subsequent paper [Ped15a].

2 Nonroot of unity case: Reduction

In this section we fix a non-root-of-unity $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

Definition 2.1 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ and let β be a root. M is called β-finite if for all $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$ we have that $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta}\lambda \cap \operatorname{wt} M$ is a finite set. Here $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta}$ is the set $\{q^{i\beta} | i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $q^{i\beta}\lambda$ just means pointwise multiplication of characters.*

As an example consider a highest weight module M. For any positive root $\beta \in \Phi^+$, M is β-finite. If M is a Verma module then M is not β-finite for any negative root $\beta \in \Phi^-$.

Proposition 2.2 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ and β a positive root. Let E_β be any choice of a root vector corresponding to β. Then the following are equivalent*

1. *M is β-finite.*

2. For all $m \in M$, $E_\beta^r m = 0$ for $r \gg 0$

Proof. Note that $E_\beta M_\lambda \subset M_{q^\beta \lambda}$. This shows that 1. implies 2.. Now assume 2. and assume M is not β-finite. Then we must have a $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$, an increasing sequence $\{j_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, weights $\mu_i = q^{j_i\beta}\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$ and weight vectors $0 \neq m_i \in M_{\mu_i}$ such that $E_\beta m_i = 0$. If $\lambda(K_\beta) = \pm q_\beta^j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ then we can asssume without loss of generality that $j \in \mathbb{N}$ since otherwise we can replace λ by $q^{j_i\beta}\lambda$ for some sufficiently large j_i.

Now consider the subalgebra D of U_q generated by E_β, $K_\beta^{\pm 1}$ and F_β where F_β is the corresponding root vector to E_β (i.e. if $E_\beta = T_w(E_{\alpha_i})$ then $F_\beta = T_w(F_{\alpha_i})$). This is a subalgebra isomorphic to $U_{q_\beta}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. For each i we get a $U_{q_\beta}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$-module Dm_i with highest weight μ_i. We claim that in each of those modules we have a weight vector $v_i \in Dm_i$ of weight λ:

To prove the claim it is enough to show that $F_\beta^{(j_i)} m_i \neq 0$ since F_β decreases the weight by β (i.e. $F_\beta M_\mu \subset M_{q^{-\beta}\mu}$). To show this we show that $E_\beta^{(j_i)} F_\beta^{(j_i)} m_i \neq 0$. In the following we will use Kac's formula:

$$E_\beta^{(r)} F_\beta^{(s)} = \sum_{j\geq 0} F_\beta^{(s-j)} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 2j-r-s \\ j \end{bmatrix} E_\beta^{(r-j)}.$$

This is a well known formula that can be found in e.g. [Jan96, Lemma 1.7] (although in this reference it is written in a slightly different form).

$$\begin{aligned} E_\beta^{(j_i)} F_\beta^{(j_i)} m_i &= \sum_{s\geq 0} F_\beta^{(j_i-s)} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 2s-2j_i \\ s \end{bmatrix} E_\beta^{(j_i-s)} m_i \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ j_i \end{bmatrix} m_i \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^{j_i} \frac{q_\beta^{1-t}\mu_i(K_\beta) - q_\beta^{t-1}\mu_i(K_\beta)^{-1}}{q_\beta^t - q_\beta^{-t}} m_i \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^{j_i} \frac{q_\beta^{2j_i+1-t}\lambda(K_\beta) - q_\beta^{-2j_i+t-1}\lambda(K_\beta)^{-1}}{q_\beta^t - q_\beta^{-t}} m_i. \end{aligned}$$

This is zero if and only if $\lambda(K_\beta) = \pm q_\beta^{-2j_i-1+t}$ for some $t = 1, \ldots, j_i$. Note that the power of q is negative in all cases here so this is not the case by the assumption above. So $F_\beta^{(j_i)} m_i \neq 0$ and we are done proving the claim. So we have $0 \neq v_i \in Dm_i$ of weight λ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Consider the $U_{q_\beta}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ element $C_\beta = F_\beta E_\beta + \frac{q_\beta K_\beta + q_\beta^{-1} K_\beta^{-1}}{(q_\beta - q_\beta^{-1})^2}$. Then C_β acts on Dm_i by the scalar

$$\frac{q_\beta \mu_i(K_\beta) + q_\beta^{-1}\mu_i(K_\beta)^{-1}}{(q_\beta - q_\beta^{-1})}.$$

If C_β acts in the same way on Dm_i and Dm_k then we must have either $\mu_i(K_\beta) = \mu_k(K_\beta)$ (i.e. $i = j$) or $\mu_i(K_\beta) = q_\beta^{-2}\mu_j(K_\beta)^{-1}$. The second case implies that $\lambda(K_\beta) = \pm q_\beta^{-a}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{N}$ which we have ruled out above. So the vectors v_i are linearly independent. Hence M contains an infinite set of linearly independent vectors of weight λ. This contradicts the fact that $M \in \mathcal{F}$. □

Proposition 2.3 *Let β be a positive root and E_β a root vector corresponding to β. Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$. The set $M^{[E_\beta]} = \{m \in M | \dim \langle E_\beta \rangle m < \infty\}$ is a U_q-submodule of M.*

Proof. Assume first that β is a simple root. We want to show that for $v \in M^{[E_\beta]}$ we have for each $u \in U_q$, $uv \in M^{[E_\beta]}$. It is enough to show this for $u = F_\alpha$, $u = K_\alpha$ and $u = E_\alpha$ for all simple roots α. If $u = K_\alpha$ there is nothing to show since K_α acts diagonally on M. If $u = F_\alpha$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$ there is nothing to show since E_β and F_α commute. If $\alpha = \beta$ then we get the result from the identity

$$E_\alpha^{(r)} F_\alpha = F_\alpha E_\alpha^{(r)} + E_\alpha^{(r-1)} [K_\alpha; r-1]$$

found in e.g. [Jan96, section 4.4]. Finally if $u = E_\alpha$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ then from the rank 2 calculations in [Lus90, section 5.3] we get:

- If $(\alpha|\beta) = 0$:
$$E_\beta^{(r)} E_\alpha = E_\alpha E_\beta^{(r)}.$$
- If $(\alpha|\beta) = -1$:
$$E_\beta^{(r)} E_\alpha = q^r E_\alpha E_\beta^{(r)} + q E_{\alpha+\beta} E_\beta^{(r-1)}$$
where $E_{\alpha+\beta} := T_{s_\alpha}(E_\beta)$.
- If $(\alpha|\beta) = -2$ and $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = -2$:
$$E_\beta^{(r)} E_\alpha = q^{2r} E_\alpha E_\beta^{(r)} + q^{r+1} E_{\alpha+\beta} E_\beta^{(r-1)} + q^2 E_{2\beta+\alpha} E_\beta^{(r-2)}$$
where $E_{\alpha+\beta} := T_{s_\alpha}(E_\beta)$ and $E_{2\beta+\alpha} := T_{s_\alpha} T_{s_\beta}(E_\alpha)$.
- If $(\alpha|\beta) = -2$ and $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = -1$: In this case we get from the calculations in [Lus90, section 5.3] that
$$E_\alpha E_\beta^{(r)} = q^{2r} E_\beta^{(r)} E_\alpha + q^2 E_\beta^{(r-1)} E_{\alpha+\beta}$$
where $E_{\alpha+\beta} := T_{s_\beta}(E_\alpha)$.

  After using the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra anti automorphism Ψ from [Lus90, section 1.1] we get
$$E_\beta^{(r)} E_\alpha = q^{2r} E_\alpha E_\beta^{(r)} + q^2 E'_{\alpha+\beta} E_\beta^{(r-1)}$$
where $E'_{\alpha+\beta} = \Psi(E_{\alpha+\beta}) = T_{s_\beta}^{-1}(E_\alpha)$.

In all cases we get that if $E_\beta^{(n)} m = 0$ for $n >> 0$ then $E_\beta^{(n)} E_\alpha m = 0$ for $n >> 0$. This proves that $uv \in \{m \in M | \dim \langle E_\beta \rangle m < \infty\}$ in this case also.

If β is not simple then $E_\beta = T_w(E_{\alpha'})$ for some simple root α' and some $w \in W$. Since T_w is an automorphism we have $T_w(U_q) = U_q$ so instead of proving the claim for $u = E_\alpha$, K_α and F_α we can show it for $u = T_w(E_\alpha)$, $T_w(K_\alpha)$ and $T_w(F_\alpha)$ so the claim follows from the calculations above. □

Lemma 2.4 *Let E_β and E'_β be two choices of root vectors. Then $M^{[E_\beta]} = M^{[E'_\beta]}$*

Proof. Suppose we have two root vectors E_β and E'_β. By Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.2 we have $\dim \left\langle E'_\beta \right\rangle m < \infty$ for all $m \in M^{[E_\beta]}$ so $M^{[E_\beta]} \subset M^{[E'_\beta]}$. Symmetrically we have also $M^{[E'_\beta]} \subset M^{[E_\beta]}$. □

Definition 2.5 *Let β be a positive root and E_β a root vector corresponding to β. Define $M^{[\beta]} = \{m \in M | \dim \langle E_\beta \rangle m < \infty\}$.*

By Lemma 2.4 this definition is independent of the chosen root vector.

Everything here that is done for a positive root β can be done for a negative root just by replacing the E's with F's, i.e. for a negative root $\beta \in \Phi^-$, $M^{[\beta]} = \{m \in M | \dim \langle F_{-\beta} \rangle m < \infty\}$ and so on.

Definition 2.6 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $\beta \in \Phi$. M is called β-free if $M^{[\beta]} = 0$.*

Note that M is β-finite if and only if $M^{[\beta]} = M$ so β-free is, in a way, the opposite of being β-finite. Suppose $L \in \mathcal{F}$ is a simple module and β a root. Then by Proposition 2.3 L is either β-finite or β-free.

Definition 2.7 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$. Define $F_M = \{\beta \in \Phi | M \text{ is } \beta\text{-finite}\}$ and $T_M = \{\beta \in \Phi | M \text{ is } \beta\text{-free}\}$. For later use we also define $F_M^s := F_M \cap (-F_M)$ and $T_M^s := T_M \cap (-T_M)$ to be the symmetrical parts of F_M and T_M.*

Note that $\Phi = F_L \cup T_L$ for a simple module L and this is a disjoint union.

Definition 2.8 *A module M is called torsion free if $T_M = \Phi$.*

Proposition 2.9 *Let L be a simple module and β a root. L is β-free if and only if $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$.*

Proof. Assume L is β-free and $\beta \in \Phi^+$. Let E_β be a corresponding root vector. The proof is similar for $\beta \in \Phi^-$ but with F instead of E. Then for all $0 \neq m \in L$, $E_\beta^{(r)} m \neq 0$. If $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} L$ then there exists $0 \neq m_\lambda \in L_\lambda$ and since $E_\beta^{(r)} m_\lambda \in L_{q^{r\beta}\lambda}$ the implication follows. For the other way assume $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$. Then L is clearly not β-finite. Since L is simple L must then be β-free. □

Proposition 2.10 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple module. T_L is a closed subset of the roots Φ. That is if $\beta, \gamma \in T_L$ and $\beta + \gamma \in \Phi$. Then $\beta + \gamma \in T_L$.*

Proof. Since L is β-free we have $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$ and since L is γ free we get further $q^{\mathbb{N}\gamma} q^{\mathbb{N}\beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$ so therefore $q^{\mathbb{N}(\beta+\gamma)} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$ hence L is $(\beta + \gamma)$ free. □

Proposition 2.11 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ be a U_q-module. F_M is a closed subset of Φ. That is if $\beta, \gamma \in F_M$ and $\beta + \gamma \in \Phi$ then $\beta + \gamma \in F_M$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta \in F_M$ with $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$. We have to show that $\alpha + \beta \in F_M$. First let us show the claim if the root system Φ is a rank 2 root system. In this case the claim will follow from the rank 2 calculations in [Lus90]. Assume $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Assume first that we have $\alpha \in \Pi$ and $\beta \in \Phi^+$. We show below that we can always reduce to this situation. We can assume $\alpha = \alpha_1$ by renumbering if neccesary. We now have 5 possibilites:

Case 0) $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = 0$ is clear.

Case 1): $(\alpha_1|\alpha_2) = -1$. The only possibility for $\beta \in \Phi^+$ such that $\alpha + \beta$ is a root is $\beta = \alpha_2$. Set $E_{\alpha+\beta} = T_{s_\beta}(E_\alpha)$ then Lusztig shows in [Lus90, section 5.5] that

$$E_{\alpha+\beta}^{(k)} = \sum_{t=0}^{k} (-1)^t q^{-t} E_\beta^{(k-t)} E_\alpha^{(k)} E_\beta^{(t)}.$$

The difference in the definition of the braid operators between [Jan96] and [Lus90] means that we have to multiply the formula in [Lus90] by $(-1)^k$ since (using the notation of [Lus90]) $E_{12} = -E_{\alpha+\beta}$. Let $m \in M$. Then there exists a $T \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E_\beta^{(t)} m = 0$ for $t \geq T$ since M is β-finite. Let $m_t = E_\beta^{(t)} m$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$. For each m_t there is a $K_t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E_\alpha^{(k)} m_t = 0$ for $k \geq K_t$ since M is α-finite. Set $K = \max\{T, K_0, \dots, K_T\}$ then the above identity shows that $E_{\alpha+\beta}^{(k)} m = 0$ for $k \geq K$

Case 2): $\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_2^\vee \rangle = -2$. In this case $\beta = \alpha_2$ is the only possibility to choose $\beta \in \Phi^+$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$. Set $E_{\alpha+\beta} = T_\alpha(E_\beta)$ then by [Lus90, section 5.5]:

$$E_{\alpha+\beta}^{(k)} = \sum_{t=0}^{k} (-1)^t q^{-2t} E_\alpha^{(k-t)} E_\beta^{(k)} E_\alpha^{(t)}$$

and the same argument as above works.

Case 3): $\langle \alpha_2, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle = -2$ and $\beta = \alpha_2$. Set $E_{\alpha+\beta} = T_\beta(E_\alpha)$ then

$$E_{\alpha+\beta}^{(k)} = \sum_{t=0}^{k} (-1)^t q^{-2t} E_\beta^{(k-t)} E_\alpha^{(k)} E_\beta^{(t)}$$

and the argument follows like in case 1) and 2).

Case 4): $\langle \alpha_2, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle = -2$ and $\beta = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. In this case set $E_\beta = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} = T_{\alpha_2}(E_{\alpha_1})$ and $E_{\alpha+\beta} = E_{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2} = T_{\alpha_2} T_{\alpha_1}(E_{\alpha_2})$. We want a property similar to the one in the other cases. We want to show that there exists $c_t \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ such that

$$E_{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2}^{(k)} = \sum_{t=0}^{k} c_t E_{\alpha_1}^{(k-t)} E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}^{(k)} E_{\alpha_1}^{(t)}.$$

We will use notation like in [Lus90] so set $E_1 = E_{\alpha_1}$, $E_{12} = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}$ and $E_{112} = E_{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By 5.3 (h) in [Lus90]

$$E_1^{(k)} E_{12}^{(k)} = (-1)^k q^k \prod_{i=1}^{k} (q^{2i}+1) E_{112}^{(k)} + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (-1)^s q^{s-s(k-s)-s(t-s)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s} (q^{2i}+1) \right) E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} E_1^{(k-s)}$$

so

$$E_{112}^{(k)} = (-1)^k c \left(E_1^{(k)} E_{12}^{(k)} - \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (-1)^s q^{s-s(k-s)-s(t-s)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s} (q^{2i}+1) \right) E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} E_1^{(k-s)} \right)$$

where $c = \left(q^k \prod_{i=1}^{k} (q^{2i}+1) \right)^{-1}$.

We will show by induction over $s < k$ that there exists $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ such that

$$E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} E_1^{(k-s)} = \sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i E_1^{(i)} E_{12}^{(k)} E_1^{(k-i)}.$$

The induction start $s = 0$ is obvious. Now observe that again from 5.3 (h) in [Lus90] we have for $s < k$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{(s)} E_{12}^{(k)} =& (-1)^s q^{s-s(k-s)} \prod_{i=1}^{s} (q^{2i}+1) E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{s-1} (-1)^n q^{n-n(s-n)-n(k-n)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} (q^{2i}+1) \right) E_{12}^{(k-n)} E_{112}^{(n)} E_1^{(s-n)}. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} = (-1)^s \left(q^{s-s(k-s)} \prod_{i=1}^{s} (q^{2i}+1) \right)^{-1} \left(E_1^{(s)} E_{12}^{(k)} - \sum_{n=0}^{s-1} (-1)^n b_n E_{12}^{(k-n)} E_{112}^{(n)} E_1^{(s-n)} \right)$$

where $b_n \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ are the coefficients above. Hence

$$E_{12}^{(k-s)} E_{112}^{(s)} E_1^{(k-s)} = (-1)^s b E_1^{(s)} E_{12}^{(k)} E_1^{(k-s)} + \sum_{n=0}^{s-1} (-1)^{s+n} b'_n E_{12}^{(k-n)} E_{112}^{(n)} E_1^{(k-n)}$$

for some coefficients b and $b'_n \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$. This identity completes the induction over s.

So to sum up we have proven that there exists $c_t \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ such that

$$E_{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2}^{(k)} = \sum_{t=0}^{k} c_t E_{\alpha_1}^{(k-t)} E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}^{(k)} E_{\alpha_1}^{(t)}.$$

(Note for later use in the root of unity case that the c_t are in the localization of $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ in the elements $(q^{2i}+1)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ which are nonzero unless q is an lth root of unity with l even). Now the proof goes as above.

The above 5 cases are the only possible cases with the above assumptions since we have excluded G_2.

We will now show how to reduce the problem to rank 2. Assume $\beta, \gamma \in F_M$ and $\beta + \gamma \in \Phi$. We will first show:

- There exists a $w \in W$ such that $w(\beta) \in \Pi$ and $w(\gamma) \in \Phi^+$.

Let $w_0 = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_N}$ be a reduced expression and let $\beta_j = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{j-1}}(\alpha_{i_j})$. Then $\Phi^+ = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N\}$. Assume first that both β and γ are positive. Then $\beta = \beta_j$ and $\gamma = \beta_r$ for some j and r. Without loss of generality we can assume $j < r$. Then we can set $w = s_{i_{j-1}} \cdots s_{i_1}$ in this case. If β and γ are both negative then $w_0(\beta)$ and $w_0(\gamma)$ are both positive and we can do as before. Assume $\beta < 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. Assume $\beta = -\beta_j$ and $\gamma = \beta_r$ for some j and r. Without loss of generality we can assume $j < r$. Then set $w = s_{i_j} \cdots s_{i_1}$. The claim has been shown.

Next we will show:

- There exists a $w \in W$ such that $w(\beta)$ and $w(\gamma)$ is contained in a rank 2 subsystem of the roots.

If $(\beta|\gamma) < 0$ then there exists a simple system Π' of Φ such that β and γ are in Π'. But since all simple system of a root system are W conjugate the claim follows. Assume $(\beta|\gamma) \geq 0$. Then $\langle \beta + \gamma, \gamma^\vee \rangle \geq \langle \gamma | \gamma^\vee \rangle = 2$ so $s_\gamma(\beta + \gamma) =$

$\beta + \gamma - \langle \beta+\gamma, \gamma^\vee \rangle \gamma \leq \beta - \gamma$. So $\beta-\gamma$ is a root in this case. Since we have excluded G_2 this means that the γ string through β is $\beta-\gamma, \beta, \beta+\gamma$ and therefore $\langle \beta+\gamma, \gamma^\vee \rangle = 2$ or equivalently $\langle \beta, \gamma^\vee \rangle = 0$. So $(\beta-\gamma|\gamma) = -(\gamma|\gamma) < 0$. Hence there is a simple system of roots Π' such that $\gamma, \beta-\gamma \in \Pi'$. So there exists w such that $w(\gamma)$ and $w(\beta-\gamma)$ are simple roots. Since $w(\beta) = w(\gamma) + w(\beta-\gamma)$ we see that $w(\beta)$ and $w(\gamma)$ are contained in a rank 2 subsystem of Φ. So the second claim is proven.

Note that ${}^wM$ is $w(\beta)$ and $w(\gamma)$ finite: Since $\operatorname{wt} {}^wM = w(\operatorname{wt} M)$ we have that a $\mu \in \operatorname{wt} {}^wM$ is of the form $\mu = w(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$. Now $q^{\mathbb{N}w(\beta)}\mu \cap \operatorname{wt} {}^wM = w(q^{\mathbb{N}\beta}\lambda \cap \operatorname{wt} M)$ is finite because M was β-finite. All in all we get that for some w we have $w(\beta+\gamma) \in F_{{}^wM}$. But since $F_{{}^wM} = w(F_M)$ this shows that $\beta+\gamma \in F_M$. $\square$

Let L be a simple module. Since F_L and T_L are both closed subsets of Φ we get from [Fer90, Lemma 4.16] that $P_L := F_L \cup T_L^s$ is a parabolic subset of the roots - i.e. $P_L \cup (-P_L) = \Phi$ and P_L is a closed subset of Φ.

Since $P_L \cup (-P_L) = \Phi$ we must have for some $w \in W$, $\Phi^+ \subset w(P_L)$. From now on we will assume $\Phi^+ \subset P_L$ since otherwise we can just describe the module ${}^wL$ and then untwist once we have described this module. So we assume $P_L = \Phi^+ \cup \langle \Pi' \rangle$ where $\Pi' \subset \Pi$ and where $\langle \Pi' \rangle$ denotes the subset of Φ generated by Π', i.e. $\langle \Pi' \rangle = \mathbb{Z}\Pi' \cap \Phi$.

Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the parabolic Lie algebra corresponding to P_L i.e. $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in P_L} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ and let $\mathfrak{l}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$ be the Levi part and the nilpotent part of $\mathfrak{p}$ respectively i.e. $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in P_L^s} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ and $\mathfrak{u} = \bigoplus_{\beta \in P_L \setminus P_L^s} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$. We can define $U_q(\mathfrak{p})$, $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$. Furthermore we can define $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ where $\mathfrak{u}^-$ is the nilpotent part of the opposite parabolic $\mathfrak{p}^-$ corresponding to $(-P_L)$. We have $U_q(\mathfrak{p}) = U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) = U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)U_q(\mathfrak{p})$.

Here is how we define the above subalgebras: (Defined like in [Pul06]) Assume $P_L = \Phi^+ \cup \langle \Pi' \rangle$. Let $w_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$ be the longest element in the Weyl group $W^{\mathfrak{l}}$ corresponding to Π'. Let w_0 be the longest element in W. Set $\overline{w} = w_0(w_0^{\mathfrak{l}})^{-1}$. Choose a reduced expression $w_0 = s_{j_1} \cdots s_{j_k} s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_h}$ such that $w_0^{\mathfrak{l}} = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_h}$. Let $\{E_\beta, F_\beta | \beta \in \Phi^+\}$ be the root vectors defined by this reduced expression.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_t^1 &= \beta_{t+k} = \overline{w} s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{t-1}}(\alpha_{i_t}), \quad t = 1, \dots, h \\ \beta_t^2 &= \beta_t = s_{j_1} \cdots s_{j_{t-1}}(\alpha_{j_t}), \quad t = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\beta_t^1} &= T_{\overline{w}} T_{s_{i_1}} \cdot T_{s_{i_{t-1}}}(F_{\alpha_{i_t}}), \quad t = 1, \dots, h \\ F_{\beta_t^2} &= T_{s_{j_1}} \cdot T_{s_{j_{t-1}}}(F_{\alpha_{j_t}}), \quad t = 1, \dots, k \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the E's.

We define

$$\begin{gathered} U_q(\mathfrak{p}) = \left\langle E_{\beta_j}, K_\mu, F_{\beta_i^1} \right\rangle_{j=1,\dots,N, \mu \in Q, i=1,\dots h}, \\ U_q(\mathfrak{l}) = \left\langle E_{\beta_i^1}, K_\mu, F_{\beta_i^1} \right\rangle_{\mu \in Q, i=1,\dots h} \end{gathered}$$

and

$$U_q(\mathfrak{u}) = \left\langle E_{\beta_i^2} \right\rangle_{i=1,\ldots,k}.$$

Similarly we define $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-) = \left\langle F_{\beta_i^2} \right\rangle_{i=1,\ldots,h}$. All of these are subalgebras of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ are independent of the chosen reduced expression of w_0 and $w_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$. Furthermore $U_q(\mathfrak{p})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ are Hopf subalgebras of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ as stated in [Pul06, Proposition 5 and Lemma 2].

There is a Q grading on U_q with $\deg E_\alpha = \alpha$, $\deg F_\alpha = -\alpha$ and $\deg K_\beta^{\pm 1} = 0$ as described in e.g. [Jan96, section 4.7]. This induces a grading on $U_q^{\pm}$ and on $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. We will define $U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}$ to be the subalgebras consisting of elements with nonzero degree (i.e. the augmentation ideals).

Definition 2.12 *Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a standard parabolic sub Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $\mathfrak{l}$, $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{u}^-$ be defined as above. Let N be a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module. We define*

$$\mathcal{M}(N) = U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U_q(\mathfrak{p})} N,$$

where N is considered as a $U_q(\mathfrak{p})$-module with $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$ acting trivially, i.e. through the coidentity $\varepsilon : U_q(\mathfrak{u}) \to \mathbb{C}$ sending everything of nonzero degree to zero.

Definition 2.13 *If M is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module we define*

$$M^{\mathfrak{u}} = \{m \in M | xm = \varepsilon(x)m,\ x \in U_q(\mathfrak{u})\}.$$

Proposition 2.14 *Let M be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module. $M^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module.*

Proof. We will show that for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{l})$, $U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}u \cap U_q(\mathfrak{g})U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0} \neq \emptyset$. This is true by simple grading considerations. We know that $U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}u \subset U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u}) = U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0} + U_q(\mathfrak{l})$. But the degree of a homogeneous element $u'u \in U_q^-$ with $u' \in U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}$ cannot be in $\mathbb{Z}\Pi'$ since that would mean $u' \in U_q(\mathfrak{l})$. So $U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}u \subset U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}$. □

Proposition 2.15 *Let N be a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module and let M be a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module. There are natural vector space isomorphisms*

$$\Phi = \Phi_{M,N} : \mathrm{Hom}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathcal{M}(N), M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{U_q(\mathfrak{l})}(N, M^{\mathfrak{u}}).$$

Proof. If $f : \mathcal{M}(N) \to M$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module map then $\Phi(f) : N \to M^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is defined by $\Phi(f) = f^{\mathfrak{u}} \circ (1 \otimes \mathrm{id}_N)$, where $1 \otimes \mathrm{id}_N : N \to \mathcal{M}(N)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is given by $n \mapsto 1 \otimes n$ and $f^{\mathfrak{u}} : \mathcal{M}(N)^{\mathfrak{u}} \to M^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is the restriction of f to $\mathcal{M}(N)^{\mathfrak{u}}$.

The inverse map Ψ is given by: For $g : N \to M^{\mathfrak{u}}$, $\Psi(g)(u \otimes n) = ug(n)$. It is easy to check that Φ and Ψ are inverse to each other. □

Proposition 2.16 *If X is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module then $\mathcal{M}(X)$ has a unique simple quotient $L(X)$.*

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Proposition 3.3 in [Fer90]: Suppose M is a submodule of $\mathcal{M}(X)$. If $0 \neq v \in M \cap (1 \otimes X)$ then $U_q v = U_q U_q(\mathfrak{l}) v = U_q(1 \otimes X) = \mathcal{M}(X)$ so $M \cap (1 \otimes X) = 0$ for every proper submodule M. Let N be the sum of all proper submodules. N is proper since $N \cap (1 \otimes X) = 0$ and maximal since it is the sum of all proper submodules. □

Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{l})$ denote the full subcategory of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-modules that consists of modules that are finitely generated over U_q and are weight modules with finite dimensional weight spaces.

Proposition 2.17 *The maps $L : N \mapsto L(N)$ and $F : V \mapsto V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ determine a bijective correspondence between the simple modules in $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{l})$ and the simple modules M in $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$ that have $M^{\mathfrak{u}} \neq 0$. L and F are inverse to each other.*

The second part of the proof is just a quantum version of the proof of Proposition 3.8 in [Fer90]. The first part is shown a little differently here.

Proof. First we will show that if V is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module with $V^{\mathfrak{u}} \neq 0$ then $V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module: Assume $0 \neq V_1 \subset V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-submodule of $V^{\mathfrak{u}}$. We will show that $V_1 = V^{\mathfrak{u}}$. Since V is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module we have $V = U_q(\mathfrak{g})V_1$. Now as a vector space we have

$$\begin{aligned} V = U_q(\mathfrak{g})V_1 = U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u})V_1 &= U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)U_q(\mathfrak{l})(U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0} + \mathbb{C})V_1 \\ &= U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)U_q(\mathfrak{l})V_1 \\ &= U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)V_1 \\ &= (U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0} + \mathbb{C})V_1 \\ &= U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}V_1 + V_1. \end{aligned}$$

We are done if we show $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}V^{\mathfrak{u}} \cap V^{\mathfrak{u}} = 0$. Observe that $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ module since $U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0} = U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}U_q(\mathfrak{l})$. Assume $v \in V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ and assume we have a $u' \in U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0}$ such that $u'v \in V^{\mathfrak{u}}$. We can assume $u' \in (U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)^{<0})_\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in Q$ and $v \in V_\mu$ for some $\mu \in X$. Assume $u'v \neq 0$. Then since V is simple there exists a $u \in U_q$ such that $uu'v = v$ but by weight considerations we must have $u \in (U_q)_{-\gamma} \subset U_q(\mathfrak{p}^-)U_q(\mathfrak{u})^{>0}$ so $uu'v = 0$ since $u'v \in V^{\mathfrak{u}}$. A contradiction.

Now assume N is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ module. $L(N)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is simple by the above. Let Φ be the isomorphism from Proposition 2.15 and consider $\Phi(p) : N \to L(N)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ where $p : \mathcal{M}(N) \to L(N)$ is the cannocial projection from $\mathcal{M}(N)$ to $L(N)$. Since Φ is an isomorphism the map $\Phi(p)$ is nonzero. Since N is simple by assumption and $L(N)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is simple by the above we get that $\Phi(p)$ is an isomorphism.

Suppose V is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module such that $V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is nonzero. Let $f = \Phi^{-1}(\mathrm{id}) : M(V^{\mathfrak{u}}) \to V$ where $\mathrm{id} : V^{\mathfrak{u}} \to V^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is the identity map. Then f is nonzero and therefore surjective because V is simple. But since $L(V^{\mathfrak{u}})$ is the unique simple quotient of $M(V^{\mathfrak{u}})$ we get $L(V^{\mathfrak{u}}) = V$. □

Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a standard parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and define $U_q(\mathfrak{p})$, $\mathfrak{l}$, $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ etc. as above. Let $\Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}$ be the roots corresponding to $\mathfrak{l}$ i.e. such that $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$. Then for $\beta \in \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}$ and a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module M we define β-finite, β-free, $M^{[\beta]}$ etc. as above. The definitions, lemmas and propositions above still hold in this case as long as we require $\beta \in \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}$ so that we actually have root vectors $E_\beta, F_\beta \in U_q(\mathfrak{l})$. We define $T_M := \{\beta \in \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}} | M^{[\beta]} = 0\}$ and $F_M := \{\beta \in \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}} | M^{[\beta]} = M\}$ i.e. as before but only for roots in $\Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}$.

By now we have reduced the problem of classifying simple modules in $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$ somewhat. If $L \in \mathcal{F}$ is a simple module we know that there exists some w such that $\Phi^+ \subset P_{{}^wL}$. Define $\mathfrak{l}$, $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ from L etc. as above, then $\Phi^{\mathfrak{l}} = \langle \Pi' \rangle = F_L^s \cup T_L^s$ where Π' is the subset of simple roots such that $P_L = \Phi^+ \cup \langle \Pi' \rangle$. From the above we get then that ${}^wL$ is completely determined by the simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module $({}^wL)^{\mathfrak{u}}$. So we have reduced the problem to looking at simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-modules N satisfying $\Phi^{\mathfrak{l}} = F_N^s \cup T_N^s$.

We claim that $\Pi' = \Pi'_{F_N^s} \cup \Pi'_{T_N^s}$ such that $F_N^s = \langle \Pi'_{F_N} \rangle$ and $T_N^s = \langle \Pi'_{T_N} \rangle$ and such that none of the simple roots in $\Pi'_{F_N^s}$ are connected to any simple root from $\Pi'_{T_N^s}$. Suppose $\alpha \in F_N^s$ is a simple root and suppose $\alpha' \in \Pi'$ is a simple root that is connected to α in the Dynkin diagram. So $\alpha + \alpha'$ is a root. There are two possibilities. Either $\alpha + \alpha' \in F_N$ or $\alpha + \alpha' \in T_N$. If $\alpha + \alpha' \in F_N$: Since F_N^s is symmetric we have $-\alpha \in F_N^s$ and since F_N is closed $\alpha' = \alpha + \alpha' + (-\alpha) \in F_N$. If $\alpha + \alpha' \in T_N$ and $\alpha' \in T_N$ then we get similarly $\alpha \in T_N$ which is a contradiction. So $\alpha' \in F_N$. We have shown that if $\alpha \in F_N$ then any simple root connected to α is in F_N also. So F_N and T_N contains different connected components of the Dynkin diagram for $\Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}$.

Let $\tau = c(\mathfrak{l}) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{F_N^s} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{F_N^s}$ and $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{g}_{T_N^s} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{T_N^s}$. Define

$$U_q(\tau) = \langle E_\alpha, K_\alpha, K_\beta, F_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \in \Pi'_{F_N^s}, \beta \in \Phi \setminus \Phi^{\mathfrak{l}}}$$

and

$$U_q(\mathfrak{t}) = \langle E_\alpha, K_\alpha, F_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \in \Pi'_{T_N^s}}.$$

Then by construction $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cong U_q(\tau) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ as a vector space via $u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto u_1 u_2$ for $u_1 \in U_q(\tau)$ and $u_2 \in U_q(\mathfrak{t})$.

To continue we want to use a result similar to [Lem69] Theorem 1 which says that there is a 1-1 correspondence between simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-modules and simple $(U_q(\mathfrak{l}))_0$ modules. Since Lemire's result is for Lie algebras we will prove the same for quantum group modules but the proofs are essentially the same. In the following $\mathfrak{l}$ is the Levi part of some standard parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ is defined as above. Note in particular that the results work for $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g}$ by choosing $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}$. For easier notation we will set $C_q := (U_q(\mathfrak{l}))_0$.

Lemma 2.18 *Let V be a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module and λ a weight of V. Then V_λ is a simple C_q-module.*

Proof. It is enough to show that for $v \in V_\lambda$ nonzero we have $V_\lambda = C_q v$ but this follows since $V_\lambda = (U_q(\mathfrak{l})v)_\lambda = (\bigoplus_\nu U_q(\mathfrak{l})_\nu v)_\lambda = U_q(\mathfrak{l})_0 v$ □

Lemma 2.19 *Assume V_1 and V_2 are simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-modules. Let $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} V_1$ and assume $(V_1)_\lambda \cong (V_2)_\lambda$ as C_q-modules. Then $V_1 \cong V_2$.*

Proof. Let $0 \neq v_i \in (V_i)_\lambda$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $(V_i)_\lambda \cong C_q / \operatorname{Ann}_{C_q}(v_i)$ as C_q-modules since $(V_i)_\lambda$ is simple (Lemma 2.18). Let $M = \operatorname{Ann}_{C_q}(v_1)$, then M is a maximal left ideal in C_q since C_q/M is simple. We will show that there exists a unique maximal ideal M' of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ containing M. Let $M'' = U_q(\mathfrak{l})M$. Then $M'' \neq U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ because $M \neq C_q$ and so there is a maximal ideal M' containing M''. To show uniqueness we will show that $U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M''$ has a unique maximal submodule (and therefore a unique simple quotient). Clearly $U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'' = \bigoplus_\gamma (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\gamma$. Let N be a submodule of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M''$. Then $N = \bigoplus_\gamma N \cap (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\gamma$. Since $(U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\lambda = (C_q/M) \cong (V_1)_\lambda$ is a simple C_q-module we have either $N \cap (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\lambda = (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\lambda$ or $N \cap (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\lambda = 0$. In the first case we have $1 + M'' \in N$ and so $N = U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M''$. So all proper submodules of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M''$ have $N \cap (U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'')_\lambda = 0$. Let N_0 be the sum of all proper submodules. Then this is the unique maximal submodule of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M''$. So there is a unique maximal submodule M' of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ containing M.

Set $M_i = \mathrm{Ann}_{C_q}(v_i)$. Then from the above we get unique maximal left ideals M_i' of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ containing M_i. By the uniqueness we have $M_i' = \mathrm{Ann}_{U_q(\mathfrak{l})}(v_i)$ and we have $V_i \cong U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M_i'$. Let $\varphi : C_q/M_1 \to C_q/M_2$ be the isomorphism between $(V_1)_\lambda$ and $(V_2)_\lambda$ and suppose $\varphi(1+M_1) = x + M_2$. Then define $\Phi : U_q/M_1' \to U_q/M_2'$ by $\Phi(u + M_1') = ux + M_2'$. Then Φ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-isomorphism because Φ is a nonzero homomorphism between two simple modules. $\square$

Lemma 2.20 *Let $\lambda \in X$. Let N be a simple C_q-module such that $K_\alpha n = \lambda(K_\alpha)n$, for all $\alpha \in \Pi$ and $n \in N$. Then there exists a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module V such that $N \cong V_\lambda$ as a C_q-module.*

Proof. Let $0 \neq n \in N$ and set $M = \mathrm{Ann}_{C_q}(n)$. Then there exists a maximal left ideal M' of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ like in the proof of Lemma 2.19. Set $V = U_q(\mathfrak{l})/M'$. This is a simple module since M' is maximal. We claim that $V_\lambda \cong N$ as C_q-modules. This follows from the fact that $C_q \cap M' = M$:

$M \subset C_q \cap M'$ by definition. Take any $x \in C_q \cap M'$ and assume $x \notin M$. Since M is maximal in C_q we must have $y \in C_q$ such that $yx - 1 \in M$ hence $1 \in M'$. This is a contradiction. So $M = C_q \cap M'$. $\square$

It now follows that we have just like Theorem 1 in [Lem69] the theorem:

Theorem 2.21 *Let $\lambda \in X$. There is a $1-1$ correspondence between simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-modules V with weight $V_\lambda \neq 0$ and simple C_q modules with weight λ given by: For V a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module, V_λ is the corresponding simple C_q-module.*

The next lemma we will prove is the equivalent of Lemma 4.5 in [Fer90]. The proof goes in almost exactly the same way.

Lemma 2.22 *Let L be a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ and $U_q(\tau)$ be defined as above. There exists a simple $U_q(\tau)$-module L_1 and a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$-module L_2 such that $L \cong L_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} L_2$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{l}) = U_q(\tau) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ module. Furthermore if $\Pi'_{T_L^s} = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \Pi'_{(T_L^s)_i}$ where $\Pi'_{(T_L^s)_i}$ are the different connected components in $\Pi'_{T_L^s}$ set $\mathfrak{t}_i = \mathfrak{g}_{(T_L)_i} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{(T_L)_i}$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_i) = \langle F_\alpha, K_\alpha, E_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \in \Pi'_{(T_L^s)_i}}$. Then $U_q(\mathfrak{t}) \cong U_q(\mathfrak{t}_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} U_q(\mathfrak{t}_s)$ and there exists simple $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_i)$-modules $(L_2)_i$ such that $L_2 \cong (L_2)_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (L_2)_s$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} U_q(\mathfrak{t}_s)$-modules.*

Proof. Let λ be one of the weights of L. Then we know that $E := L_\lambda$ is a simple finite dimensional C_q-module. Let R (respectively R_1 and R_2) denote the image of C_q (respectively $U_q(\tau)_0$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{t})_0$) in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E)$. Since E is simple we have $R = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E)$. Since $R_1 E \neq 0$ there exists a nontrivial R_1-submodule of $\mathrm{res}^R_{R_1} E$ and since E is finite dimensional there exists a *simple* R_1-submodule E_1 of $\mathrm{res}^R_{R_1} E$. The simplicity of E_1 implies that the representation $R_1 \to \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_1)$ is surjective. The kernel of $R_1 \to \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_1)$ must be $\mathrm{Ann}_{R_1}(E_1)$. But if this is nonzero then since $E = RE_1 = R_2 E_1$ and since R_1 and R_2 commutes we see that $\mathrm{Ann}_R(E)$ will be nonzero which is a contradiction since $R = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E)$. So $R_1 \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_1)$ is simple. Similarly there exists a simple R_2-module E_2 and $R_2 \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_2)$ is simple. Now as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 in [Fer90] we get $R \cong R_1 \otimes R_2$ (using [ANT44, Theorem 7.1D]). Since $R = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(E)$ it has exactly one simple module up to isomorphism. This implies that $E \cong E_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} E_2$ as R-modules.

Now set $L_1 = U_q(\tau)E_1$ and $L_2 = U_q(\mathfrak{t})E_2$. We have $L_\lambda = E \cong E_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} E_2 = (L_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} L_2)_\lambda$ and by Theorem 2.21 this implies that $L \cong L_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} L_2$.

The second part of the lemma is proved in the same way. The only thing we used about $U_q(\tau)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ was that $U_q(\mathfrak{l}) = U_q(\tau)U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ and that $U_q(\tau)_0$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{t})_0$ commutes. The same is true for $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ and the $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_i)$'s. □

To summarize we have the following equivalent of Theorem 4.18 in [Fer90]:

Theorem 2.23 *Suppose $L \in \mathcal{F}$ is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ module. Let $w \in W$ be such that $P_{{}^wL}$ is standard parabolic. With notation as above: $({}^wL)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module and this module decomposes into a tensor product $X_{\text{fin}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_{\text{fr}}$ where X_{fin} is a finite dimensional simple $U_q(\tau)$-module and X_{fr} is a torsion free $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$-module. Furthermore if $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{t}_s$ as a sum of ideals then $X_{\text{fr}} = X_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_s$ for some simple $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_i)$-modules.*

Given the pair $(X_{\text{fin}}, X_{\text{fr}})$ and the $w \in W$ defined above then L can be recovered as ${}^{\overline{w}}L(X_{\text{fin}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_{\text{fr}}))$.

So the problem of classifying simple modules in $\mathcal{F}$ is reduced to the problem of classifying finite dimensional simple modules of $U_q(\tau)$ and classifying torsion free simple modules of $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ where $\mathfrak{t}$ is a simple Lie algebra. In the next section we will show that we can make the same reduction if q is an odd root of unity. The procedure is similar but there are some differences, e.g. because the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ theory is a little different.

3 Root of unity case: Reduction

We will now consider the root of unity case. In this section $q \in \mathbb{C}$ will be assumed to be a primitive l'th root of unity where l is odd.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\lambda \in X$ and $\alpha \in \Pi$. Then $\lambda(K_\alpha) = \pm q_\alpha^k$ for some $k \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$.*

Proof. By Section 6.4 in [Lus90] we have the following relation in U_A:

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; 0 \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; -l+1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} l \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix}_{v_\alpha} \begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} l \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix}_{q_\alpha} = 0$ when q is an l'th root of unity we must have that either $q_\alpha^{-l+1}\lambda(K_\alpha) - q_\alpha^{l-1}\lambda(K_\alpha)^{-1} = 0$ or $q_\alpha^{1-k}\lambda(K_\alpha) - q_\alpha^{k-1}\lambda(K_\alpha)^{-1} = 0$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$. Writing out what these equations imply we get that $\lambda(K_\alpha) = \pm q_\alpha^k$ for some $k \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$. □

Definition 3.2

$$\Lambda_l = \{\lambda \in \Lambda | 0 \leq \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle < l, \forall \alpha \in \Pi\}$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\lambda : U_q^0 \to \mathbb{C}$ be an algebra homomorphism. Then λ is completely determined by its values on K_α and $\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix}$ with $\alpha \in \Pi$. Choosing a* *homomorphism* $\sigma : Q \to \{\pm 1\}$, *an element* $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda_l$ *and an element* $\lambda^1 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *determines a homomorphism* $\lambda \in X$ *as follows: For* $\alpha \in \Pi$*:*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(K_\alpha) =& \sigma(\alpha) q^{(\lambda^0|\alpha)} \\ \lambda(\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix}) =& \left\langle \lambda^1, \alpha^\vee \right\rangle .\end{aligned}$$

All algebra homomorphisms $\lambda : U_q^0 \to \mathbb{C}$ *are of this form, i.e.* $X = S \times \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$ *in this case, where* S *is the set of homomorphisms* $\sigma : Q \to \{\pm 1\}$*.*

Proof. We will use the relations for U_A from Section 6.4 of [Lus90]. Let $\beta \in \Pi$. If $\lambda(K_\beta) = d$ then $\lambda(K_\beta^{-1}) = d^{-1}$ and the value on $\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ t \end{bmatrix} = \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{q_\beta^{c-i+1} K_\beta - q_\beta^{i-1-c} K_\beta^{-1}}{q_\beta^i - q_\beta^{-i}}$ for $0 \leq t < l$ is also determined. The relations

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ l \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c+1 \\ l \end{bmatrix} = -q_\beta^{c+1} K_\beta \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix}$$

determine the values on $\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ t \end{bmatrix}$ for all $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ if the value on $\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$ and the value on K_β is known. Finally if $c = rl + t$ with $0 \leq t < l$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ rl+t \end{bmatrix} =& \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ rl \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -rl \\ t \end{bmatrix} \\ =& r^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ (r-1)l \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -(r-1)l \\ l \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -rl \\ t \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \\ =& (r!)^{-1} \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -sl \\ l \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -rl \\ t \end{bmatrix} .\end{aligned}$$

So determining the value on K_β and $\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix}$ determines the value on all of U_q^0.

If $\sigma, \lambda^0, \lambda^1$ is chosen as above it is easy to check that the relations from Section 6.4 in [Lus90] are satisfied. That all characters are of this form follows from Lemma 3.1. □

It can be noted in the above that $\lambda^1 = \lambda \circ \mathrm{Fr}' |_{\mathfrak{h}}$ where $\mathrm{Fr}' : U(\mathfrak{g}) \to U_q(\mathfrak{g}) / \left\langle K_\alpha^l - 1 | \alpha \in \Pi \right\rangle$ is the Frobenius map from [KL02]. We will restrict to modules of type **1** meaning $\sigma(\alpha) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$ in the above. It is standard how to get from modules of type **1** to modules of any other type σ (cf. e.g. [Jan96, Section 5.1-5.4]).

Since we restrict to modules of type 1 we will assume from now on that $X = \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$. A weight $\lambda \in X$ will also be written as $(\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$.

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $\lambda \in X$ *with* λ^0 *and* λ^1 *defined as in Lemma 3.3. Let* $\beta \in \Phi^+$*,* $c \in \mathbb{Z}$*,*

$$\lambda(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c+1 \\ l \end{bmatrix}) = \begin{cases} \lambda(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ l \end{bmatrix}) + 1 & \textit{if } \left\langle \lambda^0, \beta^\vee \right\rangle + c \equiv -1 \mod l \\ \lambda(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ l \end{bmatrix}) & \textit{otherwise} . \end{cases}$$

Proof. Set $a = \langle \lambda^0, \beta^\vee \rangle$. By $(b4)$ in Section 6.4 of [Lus90]

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c \\ l \end{bmatrix}\right) =& \lambda\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c-1 \\ l \end{bmatrix} + q_\beta^c K_\beta \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c-1 \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ =& \lambda\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; c-1 \\ l \end{bmatrix}\right) + q_\beta^{c+a} \begin{bmatrix} a+c-1 \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix}_{q_\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

$\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a+c-1 \\ l-1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]_{q_\beta}$ is zero unless $a+c-1 \equiv -1 \mod l$. If $a+c-1 \equiv -1 \mod l$ then $a+c \equiv 0 \mod l$ and so $q_\beta^{a+c} = 1$ and $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a+c-1 \\ l-1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]_{q_\beta} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} l-1 \\ l-1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]_{q_\beta} = 1$. $\square$

For a character $\lambda \in X$ and a $\mu \in Q$ we define $q^\mu \lambda$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(q^\mu \lambda)(K_\alpha) =& q^{(\mu|\alpha)} \lambda(K_\alpha) = q_\alpha^{\langle \mu, \alpha^\vee \rangle} \lambda(K_\alpha) \\ (q^\mu \lambda)\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c \\ l \end{bmatrix}\right) =& \lambda\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\alpha; c + \langle \mu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ l \end{bmatrix}\right).\end{aligned}$$

With this notation we get for a module M that $E_\alpha^{(r)} M_\lambda \subset M_{q^{r\alpha}\lambda}$ and $F_\alpha^{(r)} M_\lambda \subset M_{q^{-r\alpha}\lambda}$. Note also that $(q^{l\beta}\lambda)^1 = \lambda^1 + \beta$.

We use the same definitions as in Section 2:

Definition 3.5 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $\beta \in \Phi$. We call M β-finite if $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta}\lambda \cap \operatorname{wt} M$ is a finite set for all $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$ where $q^{\mathbb{N}\beta}\lambda = \{q^{r\beta}\lambda | r \in \mathbb{N}\}$.*

The weight vectors E_β and F_β for positive β that are not simple are defined just as before by choosing a reduced expression of w_0. By [Lus90, Section 5.6] the divided powers $E_\beta^{(r)} := \frac{1}{[r]_\beta!} E_\beta^r$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ are all contained in U_A and by abuse of notation we use the same symbol for the corresponding elements in U_q.

Proposition 3.6 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ and let β be a positive root. Let E_β be any choice of root vector corresponding to β. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *M is β-finite.*
2. *For all $m \in M$, $E_\beta^{(r)} m = 0$ for $r >> 0$*

Proof. Clearly 1. implies 2. since $E_\beta^{(r)} M_\lambda \subset M_{q^{r\beta}\lambda}$. Assume 2. and suppose M is not β finite.

We must have a $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$, an increasing sequence $\{j_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, weights $\mu_i = q^{j_i \beta}\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} M$ and weight vectors $m_i \in M_{\mu_i}$ such that $E_\beta^{(r)} m_i = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$. We can assume without loss of generality that if $\lambda\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $\lambda\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by Lemma 3.4.

Now consider the subalgebra D_β of U_q generated by $E_\beta^{(r)}$, $K_\beta^{\pm 1}$ and $F_\beta^{(r)}$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ where F_β is the root vector corresponding to E_β (i.e. if $E_\beta = T_w(E_{\alpha_i})$ then $F_\beta = T_w(F_{\alpha_i})$). For each i we get a D_β-module $D_\beta m_i$ with highest weight μ_i. We claim that in each of these modules we have at least one weight vector with one of the weights $\lambda, q^{-\beta}\lambda, \dots, q^{-(l-1)\beta}\lambda$. So we want to show for each m_i that at least one of the vectors $F_\beta^{(j_i)} m_i, F_\beta^{(j_i+1)} m_i, \dots, F_\beta^{(j_i+l-1)} m_i$ is nonzero.

We must have that one of the numbers $j_i, \dots, j_i + l - 1$ is congruent to 0 modulo l. Lets call this number k. Say $k = rl$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_\beta^{(k)} F_\beta^{(k)} m_i =& \sum_{s \geq 0} F_\beta^{(k-s)} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 2s - 2k \\ s \end{bmatrix} E_\beta^{(k-s)} m_i \\
=& \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ rl \end{bmatrix} m_i \\
=& \frac{1}{r!} \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; -sl \\ l \end{bmatrix} m_i \\
=& \frac{1}{r!} \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} (c_i - s) m_i \\
=& \binom{c_i}{r} m_i
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_i = \mu_i \left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right)$. To show that this is nonzero we must show that $c_i \notin \{0, \dots, r-1\}$. If $\lambda \left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right)$ is not an integer then this is automatically fullfilled. Otherwise we know $j_i = rl - t$ for some $t = 0, \dots, l-1$. So $\mu_i = q^{(rl-t)\beta} \lambda$ and by Lemma 3.4

$$c_i = \mu_i \left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} \right) = q^{(rl-t)\beta} \lambda \left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} \right) = \lambda \left(\begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} \right) + r - 1 \geq r.$$

Since there are infinitely many m_i's we must have infinitely many weight vectors $\{v_j\}$ of weight one of the weights $\lambda, \lambda - \beta, \dots, \lambda - (l-1)\beta$.

To show that they are linearly independent let $v_1, \dots, v_n$ be a finite set of the above weight vectors. They are all of the form $F_\beta^{(k_i)} m_i$ for some i and some k_i. Assume v_n is the vector where the power k_n is maximal. Then $E_\beta^{(k_n)} v_i = 0$ for $i \neq n$ and $E_\beta^{(k_n)} v_n \neq 0$. It follows by induction on n that the set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is linearly independent. □

We define $M^{[\beta]} = \{m \in M | \dim \left\langle E_\beta^{(r)} | r \in \mathbb{N} \right\rangle m < \infty\}$. Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 carry over with the same proof. In particular $M^{[\beta]}$ is independent of the choice of root vector E_β. Again we call M β-free if $M^{[\beta]} = 0$. Again we can show everything with F's instead of E's if β is negative.

Propositions 2.9 and 2.10 carry over with almost identical proofs. Setting $l = 1$ in the propositions and their proofs below would make the proofs identical.

Proposition 3.7 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple module and β a root. Then M is β-free if and only if $q^{\mathbb{N} l \beta} \operatorname{wt} M \subset \operatorname{wt} M$.*

Proof. Assume β is positive. If $q^{\mathbb{N} l \beta} \operatorname{wt} M \subset \operatorname{wt} M$ then M is clearly not β-finite and since M is simple we have by Proposition 2.3 that M is β-free in this case. For the other way assume M is β-free and assume we have a weight vector $0 \neq m \in M_\lambda$ such that $E_\beta^{(rl)} m = 0$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} i + rl \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right]_\beta \neq 0$ so

$$E_\beta^{(rl+i)} m = \begin{bmatrix} i + rl \\ i \end{bmatrix}_\beta^{-1} E_\beta^{(i)} E_\beta^{(rl)} m = 0$$

But this implies that $m \in M^{[\beta]}$ which contradicts the assumption that M is β-free. If β is negative we do the same with F's instead of E's. □

Proposition 3.8 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple module. T_L is a closed subset of Φ.*

Proof. Assume $\beta, \gamma \in T_L$ with $\beta + \gamma \in \Phi$. Then since $\beta \in T_L$, $q^{\mathbb{N} l \beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$. Since $\gamma \in T_L$ we get then $q^{\mathbb{N} l \gamma} q^{\mathbb{N} l \beta} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$ so $q^{\mathbb{N} l (\beta + \gamma)} \operatorname{wt} L \subset \operatorname{wt} L$. □

Proposition 3.9 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple module. F_L and T_L are closed subsets of Φ and $\Phi = F_L \cup T_L$ (disjoint union).*

Proof. T_L is closed by Proposition 3.8. F_L is closed by the same proof as the proof of Proposition 2.11. Note that the constants in the proof of Proposition 2.11 that are inverted are all nonzero even when q is a l'th root of unity as long as l is odd. □

We define P_L like in Section 2 and we assume like above that P_L is standard parabolic by considering ${}^{w}L$ for an appropiate $w \in W$. The subalgebras $U_q(\mathfrak{p})$, $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$, $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$, $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ etc. are defined as above but this time with divided powers. For example we have

$$U_q(\mathfrak{p}) = \left\langle E_{\beta_j}^{(r)}, K_\mu, F_{\beta_i^1}^{(r)} \right\rangle_{j=1,\ldots,N, \mu \in Q, i=1,\ldots,h, r \in \mathbb{N}}$$

and so on. Now the rest of the lemmas and proposition carry over with the same proofs as before and we have the following equivalent of Theorem 2.23:

Theorem 3.10 *Suppose $L \in \mathcal{F}$ is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ module. Let $w \in W$ be such that $P_{{}^{w}L}$ is standard parabolic. With notation as above: $({}^{w}L)^{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$-module and this module decomposes into a tensor product $X_{\text{fin}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_{\text{fr}}$ where X_{fin} is a finite dimensional simple $U_q(\tau)$-module and X_{fr} is a torsion free simple $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$-module. Furthermore if $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{t}_s$ as a sum of ideals then $X_{\text{fr}} = X_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_s$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{t}_s)$-module for some simple $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_i)$-modules X_i, $i = 1, \ldots, s$.*

Given the pair $(X_{\text{fin}}, X_{\text{fr}})$ and the $w \in W$ defined above then L can be recovered as ${}^{\overline{w}}(L(X_{\text{fin}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} X_{\text{fr}}))$.

So in the root of unity case we have also that to classify simple modules in $\mathcal{F}$ we just have to classify finite dimensional modules of $U_q(\tau)$ and 'torsion free' modules over $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ can be assumed to be a simple Lie algebra.

4 U_A formulas

In this section we recall from [Ped15b] some formulas for commuting root vectors with each other that will be used later. Note that in [Ped15b] the braid operators that we here call T_w are denoted by R_w. In [Ped15b] T_w denotes twisting functors.

Recall that $A = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ where v is an indeterminate and U_A is the A-subspace of U_v generated by the divided powers $E_\alpha^{(n)}$, $F_\alpha^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and K_α, K_α^{-1}.

Definition 4.1 *Let $x \in (U_v)_\mu$ and $y \in (U_v)_\gamma$ then we define*

$$[x, y]_v := xy - v^{-(\mu|\gamma)}yx$$

Theorem 4.2 *Suppose we have a reduced expression of $w_0 = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_N}$ and define root vectors $F_{\beta_1}, \dots, F_{\beta_N}$. Let $i < j$. Let $A = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ and let A' be the localization of A in* [2] *if the Lie algebra contains any B_n, C_n or F_4 part. Then*

$$[F_{\beta_j}, F_{\beta_i}]_v = F_{\beta_j}F_{\beta_i} - v^{-(\beta_i|\beta_j)}F_{\beta_i}F_{\beta_j} \in \operatorname{span}_{A'} \left\{ F_{\beta_{j-1}}^{a_{j-1}} \cdots F_{\beta_{i+1}}^{a_{i+1}} \right\}$$

Proof. [LS91, Proposition 5.5.2]. Detailed proof also in [Ped15b, Theorem 2.9].□

Definition 4.3 *Define* $\operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^i)(F_\alpha) := [[\dots[F_\alpha, F_\beta]_v \dots]_v, F_\beta]_v$ *and* $\widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^i)(F_\alpha) := [F_\beta, [\dots, [F_\beta, F_\alpha]_v \dots]]_v$ *where the commutator is taken i times from the left and right respectively.*

Proposition 4.4 *Let $u \in (U_A)_\mu$, $\beta \in \Phi^+$ and F_β a corresponding root vector. Set $r = \langle \mu, \beta^\vee \rangle$. Then in U_A we have the identity*

$$\operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^i)(u) = [i]_\beta! \sum_{n=0}^{i} (-1)^n v_\beta^{n(1-i-r)} F_\beta^{(n)} u F_\beta^{(i-n)}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^i)(u) = [i]_\beta! \sum_{n=0}^{i} (-1)^n v_\beta^{n(1-i-r)} F_\beta^{(i-n)} u F_\beta^{(n)}$$

Proof. Proposition 1.8 in [Ped15b]. □

So we can define $\operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) := ([i]!)^{-1} \operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^i)(u) \in U_A$ and $\widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) := ([i]!)^{-1}\widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^i)(u) \in U_A$.

Proposition 4.5 *Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in (U_A)_\mu$ and $r = \langle \mu, \beta^\vee \rangle$. In U_A we have the identities*

$$\begin{aligned} uF_\beta^{(a)} &= \sum_{i=0}^{a} v_\beta^{(i-a)(r+i)} F_\beta^{(a-i)} \operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{a} (-1)^i v_\beta^{a(r+i)-i} F_\beta^{(a-i)} \widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_\beta^{(a)}u &= \sum_{i=0}^{a} v_\beta^{(i-a)(r+i)} \widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) F_\beta^{(a-i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{a} (-1)^i v_\beta^{a(r+i)-i} \operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^{(i)})(u) F_\beta^{(a-i)} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Proposition 1.9 in [Ped15b]. □

Proposition 4.6 *For* $x_1 \in (U_A)_{\mu_1}$, $x_2 \in (U_A)_{\mu_2}$ *and* $y \in (U_A)_\gamma$ *we have*

$$[y, x_1x_2]_v = x_1[y, x_2]_v + v^{-(\gamma|\mu_2)}[y, x_1]_v x_2$$

and

$$[x_1x_2, y]_v = v^{-(\gamma|\mu_1)}x_1[x_2, y]_v + [x_1, y]_v x_2$$

Proof. Direct calculation. □

Let $s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_N}$ be a reduced expression of w_0 and construct root vectors F_{β_i}, $i = 1, \dots, N$. In the next lemma F_{β_i} refers to the root vectors constructed as such. In particular we have an ordering of the root vectors.

Lemma 4.7 *Let* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *Let* $1 \leq j < k \leq N$.
$\operatorname{ad}(F_{\beta_j}^{(i)})(F_{\beta_k}^{(n)}) = 0$ *and* $\widetilde{\operatorname{ad}}(F_{\beta_k}^{(i)})(F_{\beta_j}^{(n)}) = 0$ *for* $i \gg 0$.

Proof. Lemma 1.11 in [Ped15b]. □

5 Ore localization and twists of localized modules

In this section q will be a complex primitive l'th root of unity with l odd. Recall that we will assume $X = \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$ in this case restricting to modules of type 1. For an element $\lambda \in X$ we define $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda_l$ and $\lambda^1 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ as in Lemma 3.3 such that $\lambda(K_\alpha) = q^{\left(\lambda^0|\alpha\right)}$ and $\lambda(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} K_\alpha;0 \\ l \end{smallmatrix}\right]) = \left\langle \lambda^1, \alpha^\vee \right\rangle$ for $\alpha \in \Pi$ and we will also write $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in X$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let* β *be a positive root and* F_β *a corresponding root vector. The set*

$$\{r!F_\beta^{(rl)} | r \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{\left(F_\beta^{(l)}\right)^r | r \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is an Ore subset of U_q.

Proof. We can assume β is simple since otherwise $F_\beta = T_w(F_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \Pi$ and some $w \in W$ and $T_w(U_q) = U_q$. Since $r!F_\beta^{(rl)} k!F_\beta^{(kl)} = (r+k)!F_\beta^{(rl+kl)}$ the set is multiplicative and does not contain 0. We will show the Ore property for each generator of U_q. First consider $\alpha \in \Pi$ a simple root not equal to β. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have the following identities for $r \geq 1$ (cf. Proposition 4.5)

$$\begin{aligned} r!F_\beta^{(rl)} E_\alpha^{(n)} =& E_\alpha^{(n)} r!F_\beta^{(rl)} \\ r!F_\beta^{(rl)} K_\alpha^{\pm 1} =& K_\alpha^{\pm 1} r!F_\beta^{(rl)} \\ F_\alpha^{(n)} r!F_\beta^{(rl)} =& r!F_\beta^{(rl)} F_\alpha^{(n)} \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} \sum_{i=kl+1}^{kl+l} c_i (r-k-1)! F_\beta^{(rl-kl-l)} F_\beta^{(kl+l-i)} \operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^{(i)})(F_\alpha^{(n)}) \end{aligned}$$

where $c_i = q_\beta^{i(i+\langle\alpha,\beta^\vee\rangle)} r(r-1)\cdots(r-k)$. Finally we have the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ identities for $0 \leq i \leq l$:

$$\begin{aligned} r! F_\beta^{(rl)} F_\beta^{(n)} =& F_\beta^{(n)} r! F_\beta^{(rl)} \\ E_\beta^{(i)} r! F_\beta^{(rl)} =& r! F_\beta^{(rl)} E_\beta^{(i)} + \sum_{t=1}^{i} r(r-1)! F_\beta^{(rl-l)} F_\beta^{(l-t)} E_\beta^{(i-t)} \begin{bmatrix} K_\beta; i-rl \\ t \end{bmatrix}_\beta . \end{aligned}$$

So we have shown that it is an Ore set. □

We will denote the Ore localization of U_q in the above set by $U_{q(F_\beta)}$. For a U_q-module M we define $M_{(F_\beta)} := U_{q(F_\beta)} \otimes_{U_q} M$. We write the inverse of $F_\beta^{(rl)}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ as $F_\beta^{(-rl)}$ i.e. $F_\beta^{(-rl)} = r! \left(r! F_\beta^{(rl)} \right)^{-1} \in U_{q(F_\beta)}$.

Lemma 5.2 *Let* $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*$, $\beta \in \Phi^+$ *and let* F_β *be a corresponding root vector. Let* I_λ *be the left* $U_{q(F_\beta)}$*-ideal* $U_{q(F_\beta)}\{(u - \lambda(u)) | u \in U_q^0\}$*. Then there exists, for each* $b \in \mathbb{C}$*, an automorphism of* $U_{q(F_\beta)}$*-modules* $\psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda : U_{q(F_\beta)}/I_\lambda \to U_{q(F_\beta)}/I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+b\beta)}$ *such that for* $u \in U_{q(F_\beta)}$ *and* $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\psi_{F_\beta,i}^\lambda(u + I_\lambda) = F_\beta^{(-il)} u F_\beta^{(il)} + I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+i\beta)}$ *and the map* $b \mapsto \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(u + I_\lambda)$ *is polynomial in* b*. Furthermore* $\psi_{F_\beta,b'}^{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+b\beta)} \circ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda = \psi_{F_\beta,b+b'}^\lambda$ *for* $b, b' \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. If β is not simple then $F_\beta = T_w(F_\alpha)$ for some simple root $\alpha \in \Pi$. Then we define $\psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(u) = T_w(\psi_{F_\alpha,b}^{w\lambda}(T_w^{-1}(u)))$ where $T_w^{-1}(F_\beta^{(-l)}) = F_\alpha^{(-l)}$ and $T_w(F_\alpha^{(-l)}) = F_\beta^{(-l)}$. So we assume from now on that $\beta \in \Pi$.

We define $\psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda$ on generators: For $\alpha \in \Pi \backslash \{\beta\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(E_\alpha^{(n)}) =& E_\alpha^{(n)} \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(F_\alpha^{(n)}) =& F_\alpha^{(n)} \\ & - \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{b}{k+1} \sum_{i=kl+1}^{kl+l} q_\beta^{i(\langle\alpha|\beta^\vee\rangle - i)} F_\beta^{(-kl-l)} F_\beta^{(kl+l-i)} \operatorname{ad}(F_\beta^{(i)})(F_\alpha^{(n)}) \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(K_\alpha^{\pm 1}) =& \lambda(K_\alpha^{\pm 1}) \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(F_\beta^{(n)}) =& F_\beta^{(n)} \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(E_\beta) =& E_\beta + b F_\beta^{(-l)} F_\beta^{(l-1)} [\langle\lambda_0, \beta^\vee\rangle + 1]_\beta \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(E_\beta^{(l)}) =& E_\beta^{(l)} + b F_\beta^{(-l)} \sum_{t=1}^{l-1} F_\beta^{(l-t)} E_\beta^{(l-t)} \begin{bmatrix} \langle\lambda_0, \beta^\vee\rangle \\ t \end{bmatrix}_\beta + b F_\beta^{(-l)} (\langle\lambda_1, \beta^\vee\rangle + 1 - b) \\ \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(K_\beta^{\pm 1}) =& \lambda(K_\beta^{\pm 1}). \end{aligned}$$

The sum given in the formula for $F_\alpha^{(n)}$ is finite by Lemma 4.7. It is easy to check that $\psi_{F_\beta,i}^\lambda(u + I_\lambda) = F_\beta^{(-il)} u F_\beta^{(il)} + I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+b\beta)}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and it is seen from the formulas that $b \mapsto \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(u + I_\lambda)$ is polynomial. So $\psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda$ satisfies the generating relations of U_q for $b \in \mathbb{N}$ hence it satisfies the generating relations for all $b \in \mathbb{C}$ because $\psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(u)$ is polynomial in b. Similarly we can show the rest of the claims by using the fact that $b \mapsto \psi_{F_\beta,b}^\lambda(u)$ is polynomial. □

We will define a twist of the action of a $U_{q(F_\beta)}$-module:

Definition 5.3 *Let M be a $U_{q(F_\beta)}$-module. We define $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.M$ to be the module equal to M as a vector space with action twisted via $\psi_{F_\beta,b}$: For $m \in M$ we denote the corresponding element in $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.M$ by $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.m$. Let $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \operatorname{wt} M$ and assume $m \in M_\lambda$. We have a homomorphism of $U_{q(F_\beta)}$-modules $\pi : U_{q(F_\beta)}/I_\lambda \to M$ defined by sending $u + I_\lambda$ in $U_{q(F_\beta)}/I_\lambda$ to um. We define for $u \in U_{q(F_\beta)}$:*

$$u \cdot \psi_{F_\beta,b}.m = \psi_{F_\beta,b}.\left(\pi(\psi_{F_\beta,b}^{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-b\beta)}(\overline{u}))\right)$$

where $\overline{u} = u + I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-b\beta)} \in U_{q(F_\beta)}/I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-b\beta)}$.

Lemma 5.4 *Let M be a $U_{q(F_\beta)}$-module. Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

$$\psi_{F_\beta,r}.M \cong M.$$

Furthermore for $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \operatorname{wt} M$ we have as $(U_{q(F_\beta)})_0$-modules

$$\psi_{F_\beta,r}.M_\lambda \cong M_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-r\beta)}.$$

Proof. The isomorphism in both cases is given by $\psi_{F_\beta,r}.m \mapsto F_\beta^{(rl)}m$. Using the fact that $\psi_{F_\beta,r}^{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-r\beta)}(u + I_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1-r\beta)}) = F_\beta^{(-rl)}uF_\beta^{(rl)} + I_\lambda$ it is easy to show that this is a homomorphism and the inverse is given by multiplying by $F_\beta^{(-rl)}$.$\square$

Definition 5.5 *Let $\Sigma \subset \Phi^+$. Then Σ is called a set of commuting roots if there exists an ordering of the roots in Σ; $\Sigma = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s\}$ such that for some reduced expression of w_0 and corresponding construction of the root vectors F_β we have: $[F_{\beta_j}, F_{\beta_i}]_q = 0$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq s$.*

For any subset $I \subset \Pi$, let Q_I be the subgroup of Q generated by I, Φ_I the root system generated by I , $\Phi_I^+ = \Phi^+ \cap \Phi_I$ and $\Phi_I^- = -\Phi_I^+$.

We have the following equivalent of Lemma 4.1 in [Mat00]:

Lemma 5.6 *1. Let $I \subset \Pi$ and let $\alpha \in I$. There exists a set of commuting roots $\Sigma' \subset \Phi_I^+$ with $\alpha \in \Sigma'$ such that Σ' is a basis of Q_I.*

2. Let J, F be subsets of Π with $F \neq \Pi$. Let $\Sigma' \subset \Phi_J^+ \backslash \Phi_{J\cap F}^+$ be a set of commuting roots which is a basis of Q_J. There exists a set of commuting roots Σ which is a basis of Q such that $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma \subset \Phi^+ \backslash \Phi_F^+$

Proof. The first part of the proof is just combinatorics of the root system so it is identical to the first part of the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [Mat00]: Let us first prove assertion 2.: If J is empty we can choose $\alpha \in \Pi \backslash F$ and replace J and Σ' by $\{\alpha\}$. So assume from now on that $J \neq \emptyset$. Set $J' = J \backslash F$, $p = |J'|$, $q = |J|$. Let $J_1, \dots, J_k$ be the connected components of J and set $J_i' = J' \cap J_i$, $F_i = F \cap J_i$, and $\Sigma_i' = \Sigma \cap \Phi_{J_i}$, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since $\Sigma' \subset \Phi_J$ is a basis of Q_J, each Σ_i' is a basis of Q_{J_i}. Since Σ_i' lies in $\Phi_{J_i}^+ \backslash \Phi_{F_i}^+$, the set $J_i' = J_i \backslash F_i$ is not empty. Hence J' meets every connected component of J. Therefore we can write $J = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q\}$ in such a way that $J' = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p\}$ and, for any s with $p + 1 \leq s \leq q$, α_s is connected to α_i for some $i < s$. Since Π is connected we can write $\Pi \backslash J = \{\alpha_{q+1}, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ in such a way that, for any $s \geq q + 1$, α_s is connected to α_i for some i with $1 \leq i < s$. So $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$ such that for $s > p$ we have that α_s is connected to some α_i with $1 \leq i < s$.

Let $\Sigma' = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_q\}$. We will define $\beta_{q+1}, \ldots, \beta_l$ inductively such that for each $s \geq q$, $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s\}$ is a commuting set of roots which is a basis of $\Phi_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_s\}}$. So assume we have defined $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$. Let w_s be the longest word in $s_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_s}$ and let w_{s+1} be the longest word in $s_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_{s+1}}$. Choose a reduced expression of w_s such that the corresponding root vectors $\{F_\beta\}$ satisfies $[F_{\beta_j}, F_{\beta_i}]_q = 0$ for $i < j$. Choose a reduced expression of $w_{s+1} = w_s w'$ starting with the above reduced expression of w_s. Let N_s be the length of w_s and N_{s+1} be the length of w_{s+1}. So we get an ordering of the roots generated by $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{s+1}\}$: $\Phi^+_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{s+1}\}} = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{N_s}, \gamma_{N_s+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{N_{s+1}}\}$ with $\Phi^+_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_s\}} = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{N_s}\}$. Consider $\gamma_{N_s+1} = w_s(\alpha_{s+1})$. Since w_s only consists of the simple reflections corresponding to $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s$ we must have that $\gamma_{N_s+1} = \alpha_{s+1} + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i \alpha_i$ for some coefficients $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$. So $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s, \gamma_{N_s+1}\}$ is a basis of $\Phi_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{s+1}\}}$. From Theorem 4.2 we get for $1 \leq i \leq s$

$$[F_{\gamma_{N_s+1}}, F_{\beta_i}]_q \in \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ F_{\gamma_2}^{a_2} \cdots F_{\gamma_{N_s}}^{a_{N_s}} | a_i \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

But since $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{N_s}\} = \Phi^+_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_s\}}$ and since $\gamma_{N_s+1} = \alpha_{s+1} + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i \alpha_i$ we get $[F_{\gamma_{N_s+1}}, F_{\beta_i}]_q = 0$.

All that is left is to show that $\gamma_{N_s+1} \notin \Phi_F$. By the above we must have that α_{s+1} is connected to some $\alpha_i \in J'$. We will show that the coefficient of α_i in γ_{N_s+1} is nonzero. Otherwise $(\gamma_{N_s+1}|\alpha_i) < 0$ and so $\gamma_{N_s+1} + \alpha_i \in \Phi_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{s+1}\}}$ and by Theorem 1 in [Pap94], $\gamma_{N_s+1} + \alpha_i = \gamma_j$ for some $1 < j \leq s$. This is impossible since $\gamma_{N_s+1} + \alpha_i \notin \Phi_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_s\}}$. So we can set $\beta_{s+1} = \gamma_{N_s+1}$ and the induction step is finished.

To prove assertion 1. it can be assumed that $I = \Pi$. Thus assertion 1. follows from assertion 2. with $J = \{\alpha\}$ and $F = \emptyset$. □

Lemma 5.7 *Let $\Sigma = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}$ be a set of commuting roots with corresponding root vectors $F_{\beta_1}, \ldots, F_{\beta_n}$, then $F_{\beta_1}^{(l)}, \ldots, F_{\beta_n}^{(l)}$ commute.*

Proof. Calculating in U_v for $i < j$ we get using Proposition 4.6

$$[F_{\beta_j}^{(l)}, F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}]_v = \frac{1}{([l]_v!)^2}[F_{\beta_j}^l, F_{\beta_i}^l]_v = 0$$

hence $v^{(l\beta_i|l\beta_j)} F_{\beta_i}^{(l)} F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} - F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} F_{\beta_i}^{(l)} = 0$ in U_A. Since $[F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}, F_{\beta_j}^{(l)}]_q = q^{l^2(\beta_i|\beta_j)} F_{\beta_i}^{(l)} F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} - F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} F_{\beta_i}^{(l)} = F_{\beta_i}^{(l)} F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} - F_{\beta_j}^{(l)} F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}$ we have proved the lemma. □

Corollary 5.8 *Let $\Sigma = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}$ be a set of commuting roots with corresponding root vectors $F_{\beta_1}, \ldots, F_{\beta_n}$. The set*

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Sigma :=& \{r_1! F_{\beta_1}^{(r_1 l)} \cdots r_n! F_{\beta_n}^{(r_n l)} | r_1, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ =& \{\left(F_{\beta_1}^{(l)}\right)^{r_1} \cdots \left(F_{\beta_n}^{(l)}\right)^{r_n} | r_1, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{N}\} \end{aligned}$$

is an Ore subset of U_q.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.1. □

We let $U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$ denote the Ore localization of U_q in the Ore subset F_Σ. For a U_q-module M we define $M_{F_\Sigma} = U_{q(F_\Sigma)} \otimes_{U_q} M$.

Definition 5.9 *Let $\Sigma = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}$ be a set of commuting roots that is a basis of Q with a corresponding Ore subset F_Σ. Let $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \beta_i$ for some $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$. For a $U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$-module M we define $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.M = \psi_{F_{\beta_1},a_1} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{F_{\beta_n},a_n}.M$.*

Corollary 5.10 *Let Σ be a set of commuting roots that is a basis of Q. Let $\mu \in Q$ and let M be a $U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$-module. Then*

$$\psi_{F_\Sigma,\mu}.M \cong M$$

as $U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$-modules. Also for $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \operatorname{wt} M$:

$$\psi_{F_\Sigma,\mu}.M_\lambda \cong M_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+\mu)}$$

as $(U_{q(F_\Sigma)})_0$-modules.

Proof. Since Σ is a basis of Q we can write $\mu = \sum_{\beta\in\Sigma} a_\beta \beta$ for some $a_\beta \in \mathbb{Z}$. So the corollary follows from Lemma 5.4. $\square$

Definition 5.11 *A module $M \in \mathcal{F}$ is called admissible if its weights are contained in a single coset of $(\Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*)/(\Lambda_l \times Q)$ and if the dimensions of the weight spaces are uniformly bounded. M is called admissible of degree d if d is the maximal dimension of the weight spaces in M.*

Of course all finite dimensional simple modules are admissible but the interesting admissible modules are the infinite dimensional admissible simple modules. In particular simple torsion free modules in $\mathcal{F}$ are admissible. We show later that each infinite dimensional simple module L gives rise to a 'coherent family' $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ containing at least one simple highest weight module that is admissible of the same degree.

We need the equivalent of Lemma 3.3 in [Mat00]. Some of the proofs leading up to this are more or less the same as in [Mat00] but for completenes we include it here as well.

Definition 5.12 *A cone C is a finitely generated submonoid of the root lattice Q containing 0. If L is a simple module define the cone of L, $C(L)$, to be the submonoid of Q generated by T_L.*

Lemma 5.13 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be an infinite dimensional simple module. Then the group generated by the submonoid $C(L)$ is Q.*

Compare [Mat00] Lemma 3.1

Proof. First consider the case where $T_L \cap (-F_L) = \emptyset$. Then in this case we have $\Phi = T_L^s \cup F_L^s$. Since F_L^s and T_L^s contain different connected components of the Dynkin diagram and since L is simple and infinite we must have $\Phi = T_L^s$ and therefore $C(L) = Q$.

Next assume $T_L \cap (-F_L) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 4.16 in [Fer90] $P_L = T_L^s \cup F_L$ and $P_L^- = T_L \cup F_L^s$ are two opposite parabolic subsystems of Φ. So we have that $T_L \cap (-F_L)$ and $(-T_L) \cap F_L$ must be the roots corresponding to the nilradicals $\mathfrak{v}^\pm$ of two opposite parabolic subalgebras $\mathfrak{p}^\pm$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. Since we have $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v}^+ + \mathfrak{v}^- + [\mathfrak{v}^+, \mathfrak{v}^-]$ we get that $T_L \cap (-F_L)$ generates Q. Since $C(L)$ contains $T_L \cap (-F_L)$ it generates Q. $\square$

Definition 5.14 *Let $x \geq 0$ be a real number. Define $\rho_l(x) = \operatorname{Card} B_l(x)$ where $B_l(x) = \{\mu \in lQ | \sqrt{(\mu|\mu)} \leq x\}$ and $lQ = \{l\mu \in Q | \mu \in Q\}$.*

Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ be a weight module with all weights lying in a single coset of $(\Lambda_l \times \mathfrak{h}^*)/(\Lambda_l \times Q)$ say $(0, \lambda^1) + (\Lambda_l \times Q)$. The density of M is

$$\delta_l(M) = \liminf_{x\to\infty} \rho_l(x)^{-1} \sum_{\mu^0\in\Lambda_l, \mu^1\in B_l(x)} \dim M_{q^{\mu^1}(\mu^0,\lambda^1)}.$$

For a cone C we define $\delta(C) = \liminf_{x\to\infty} \rho_1(x)^{-1} \operatorname{Card}(C \cap B_1(x)) = \liminf_{x\to\infty} \rho_l(x)^{-1} \operatorname{Card}(lC \cap B_l(x))$ where $lC = \{lc \in Q | c \in C\}$.

Lemma 5.15 *There exists a real number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\delta_l(L) > \varepsilon$ for all infinite dimensional simple modules L.*

Proof. Note that since $q^{lC(L)}\lambda \subset \operatorname{wt} L$ for all $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} L$ we have $\delta_l(L) \geq \delta(C(L))$.

Since $C(L)$ is the cone generated by T_L and $T_L \subset \Phi$ (a finite set) there can only be finitely many different cones.

Since there are only finitely many different cones attached to infinite simple dimensional modules and since any cone C that generates Q has $\delta(C) > 0$ we conclude via Lemma 5.13 that there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\delta_l(L) > \varepsilon$ for all infinite dimensional simple modules. ☐

Definition 5.16 *Let M be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module. We can make M into a U_q-module by the Frobenius homomorphism: We define $M^{[l]}$ to be the U_q-module equal to M as a vector space and with the action defined as follows: For $m \in M$, $\alpha \in \Pi$,*

$$\begin{aligned} K_\alpha^{\pm 1} m &= m \\ E_\alpha m &= 0 \\ E_\alpha^{(l)} m &= e_\alpha m \\ F_\alpha m &= 0 \\ F_\alpha^{(l)} m &= f_\alpha m \end{aligned}$$

where e_α is a root vector of $\mathfrak{g}$ of weight α and f_α is such that $[e_\alpha, f_\alpha] = h_\alpha$. The above defines an action of U_q on M by Theorem 1.1 in [KL02].

Proposition 5.17 *Let $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in X$ and let $L(\lambda)$ be the unique simple highest weight module with weight λ. Then $L(\lambda) \cong L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))$ where $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)$ denotes the unique simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight λ^1.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.1 in [AM15] works here in exactly the same way. ☐

Lemma 5.18 *Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ be an admissible module. Then M has finite Jordan-Hölder length.*

Proof. As M is admissible, we have $\delta_l(M) < \infty$. For any exact sequence $0 \to M_1 \to M_2 \to M_3 \to 0$, we have $\delta_l(M_2) \geq \delta_l(M_1) + \delta_l(M_3)$. Let Y be the set of all $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that $|\langle \mu, \alpha^\vee \rangle| \leq 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$. By Proposition 5.17 and the classification of classical simple finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-modules any finite dimensional U_q-module L has $L_{(\mu^0,\mu^1)} \neq 0$ for some $\mu^0 \in \Lambda_l$ and some $\mu^1 \in Y$. It follows like in [Mat00, Lemma 3.3] that the length of M is finite and bounded by $A + \delta_l(M)/\varepsilon$ where $A = \sum_{\mu^0\in\Lambda_l,\mu^1\in Y} \dim M_{(\mu^0,\mu^1)}$ and ε is the constant from Lemma 5.15. ☐

Lemma 5.19 *Let M be an admissible module. Let $\Sigma \subset \Phi^+$ be a set of commuting roots and F_Σ a corresponding Ore subset. Assume $-\Sigma \subset T_M$. Then for $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in X$:*

$$\dim (M_{F_\Sigma})_\lambda = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Sigma} \{\dim M_{(\lambda^0, \lambda^1 + \mu)}\}$$

and if $\dim M_\lambda = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Sigma}\{\dim M_{(\lambda^0,\lambda^1+\mu)}\}$ then $(M_{F_\Sigma})_\lambda \cong M_\lambda$ as $(U_q)_0$-modules.

In particular if $\Sigma \subset T_M$ as well then $M_{F_\Sigma} \cong M$ as U_q-modules.

Compare to Lemma 4.4(ii) in [Mat00].

Proof. We have $\Sigma = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r\}$ for some $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \in \Phi^+$. Let $F_{\beta_1}, \dots, F_{\beta_r}$ be corresponding q-commuting root vectors. Let $\lambda \in X$ and set

$$d = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Sigma} \{\dim M_{(\lambda^0, \lambda^1+\mu)}\}.$$

Let V be a finite dimensional subspace of $(M_{F_\Sigma})_\lambda$. Then there exists a homogenous element $s \in F_\Sigma$ such that $sV \subset M$. Let $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}\Sigma$ be the degree of s. So $sV \subset M_{q^\nu \lambda}$ hence $\dim sV \leq d$. Since s acts injectively on M_{F_Σ} we have $\dim V \leq d$. Now the first claim follows because $F_\beta^{(\pm l)}$ acts injectively on M_{F_Σ} for all $\beta \in \Sigma$.

We have an injective U_q-homomorphism from M to M_{F_Σ} sending $m \in M$ to $1 \otimes m \in M_{F_\Sigma}$ that restricts to a $(U_q)_0$-homomorphism from M_λ to $(M_{F_\Sigma})_\lambda$. If $\dim M_\lambda = d$ then this is surjective as well. So it is an isomorphism. The last claim follows because $\pm\Sigma \subset T_M$ implies $\dim M_\lambda = \dim M_{q^\mu \lambda}$ for any $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}l\Sigma$; so $M_\lambda \cong (M_{F_\Sigma})_\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in X$. Since M is a weight module this implies that $M \cong M_{F_\Sigma}$ as U_q-modules. □

Lemma 5.20 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ module. Then the weight spaces of L are all 1-dimensional.*

Proof. For $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ there is only one simple root α and we will denote the root vectors E_α and F_α by E and F respectively. Similarly $K^{\pm 1} = K_\alpha^{\pm 1}$. Consider the Casimir element $C = EF + \frac{q^{-1}K + qK^{-1}}{(q-q^{-1})^2}$. Let $\lambda \in \operatorname{wt} L$ and let $c \in \mathbb{C}$ be an eigenvalue of C on L_λ. Consider the eigenspace $L(c) = \{v \in L_\lambda | Cv = cv\}$. Then $F^{(l)}E^{(l)}$ acts on this space since C commutes with all elements from $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. Choose an eigenvector $v_0 \in L(c)$ for $F^{(l)}E^{(l)}$. We will show by induction that $E^{(n)}F^{(n)}v_0 \in \mathbb{C}v_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The induction start $n = 0$ is obivous. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume $n = i + rl$ with $0 \leq i < l$. If $i \neq 0$ then $[n] \neq 0$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(n)}F^{(n)}v_0 =& \frac{1}{[n]^2} E^{(n-1)} E F F^{(n-1)} v_0 \\ =& \frac{1}{[n]^2} E^{(n-1)} \left(C - \frac{q^{-1}K + qK^{-1}}{(q-q^{-1})^2} \right) F^{(n-1)} v_0 \\ =& \frac{1}{[n]^2} E^{(n-1)} F^{(n-1)} \left(c - \frac{q^{\left(\lambda^0|\alpha\right)+1-2n} + q^{2n-1-\left(\lambda^0|\alpha\right)}}{(q-q^{-1})^2} \right) v_0 \end{aligned}$$

where α is the simple root. So the claim follows by induction. In the case that

$i = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{(n)}F^{(n)}v_0 =& \frac{1}{r}E^{(rl-l)}E^{(l)}F^{(rl)}v_0 \\
=& \frac{1}{r}E^{(rl-l)}\sum_{t=0}^{l}F^{(rl-t)}\begin{bmatrix}K; 2t-rl-l \\ t\end{bmatrix}E^{(l-t)}v_0 \\
=& \frac{1}{r}E^{(rl-l)}\sum_{t=0}^{l}F^{(rl-l)}F^{(l-t)}E^{(l-t)}\begin{bmatrix}K; l-rl \\ t\end{bmatrix}v_0 \\
=& \frac{1}{r}E^{(rl-l)}F^{(rl-l)}\left(F^{(l)}E^{(l)} + \sum_{t=1}^{l-1}F^{(l-t)}E^{(l-t)}\begin{bmatrix}(\lambda^0|\alpha)+l-rl \\ t\end{bmatrix} + \langle \lambda^1, \alpha^\vee\rangle + 1 - r\right)v_0
\end{aligned}$$

Since v_0 is an eigenvector for $F^{(l)}E^{(l)}$ we have only left to consider the action of $F^{(i)}E^{(i)}$ for $1 \leq i < l$. But we can show like above that $F^{(i)}E^{(i)}v_0 \in \mathbb{C}v_0$ by using that $C = FE + \frac{qK+K^{-1}q^{-1}}{(q-q^{-1})^2}$.

Now since L is simple we must have that L_λ is a simple $(U_q)_0$-module (Lemma 2.18). So L_λ is generated by v_0. Since $E^{(n)}F^{(n)}v_0 \in \mathbb{C}v_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{C}$ we get $\dim L_\lambda = 1$. □

Lemma 5.21 *Let L be a simple infinite dimensional admissible module. Let $\beta \in (T_L^s)^+$. Then there exists a $b \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.L_{F_\beta}$ contains a simple admissible U_q-submodule L' with $T_{L'} \subset T_L$ and $\beta \notin T_{L'}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.19 $L \cong L_{F_\beta}$ as U_q-modules so we will write L instead of L_{F_β} when taking twist. The $U_{q(F_\beta)}$-module structure on L coming from the isomorphism. Let D_β be the subalgebra of U_q generated by $E_\beta^{(n)}$, $K_\beta^{\pm 1}$, $F_\beta^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then D_β is isomorphic to the algebra $U_{q_\beta}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. Let $v \in L$ and consider the D_β-module $D_\beta v$. Since L is admissible so is $D_\beta v$. So $D_\beta v$ has a simple D_β-submodule V by Lemma 5.18.

Let $v \in V$ be a weight vector such that $E_\beta v = 0$ (such a v always exists since $E_\beta^l = 0$). Assume λ is the weight of v. By Lemma 5.20 $F_\beta^{(l)}E_\beta^{(l)}v = cv$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then by (the proof of) Lemma 5.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_\beta^{(l)}E_\beta^{(l)}\psi_{F_\beta,b}.v \\
&\quad =\psi_{F_\beta,b}.\left(c + b\sum_{t=1}^{l-1}F_\beta^{(l-t)}E_\beta^{(l-t)}\begin{bmatrix}\langle \lambda_0, \beta^\vee\rangle \\ t\end{bmatrix}_\beta + b(\langle \lambda_1, \beta^\vee\rangle + 1 - b)\right)v \\
&\quad =\psi_{F_\beta,b}.\left(c + b(\langle \lambda_1, \beta^\vee\rangle + 1 - b)\right)v.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{C}$ is algebraically closed the polynomial in b, $c+b(\langle \lambda_1, \beta^\vee\rangle+1-b)$ has a zero. Assume from now on that $b \in \mathbb{C}$ is chosen such that $c+b(\langle \lambda_1, \beta^\vee\rangle+1-b) = 0$.

Thus $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.L$ contains an element $v' = \psi_{F_\beta,b}.v$ such that $F_\beta^{(l)}E_\beta^{(l)}v' = 0$ and since $F_\beta^{(l)}$ acts injectively on $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.L$, we have $E_\beta^{(l)}v' = 0$. Set $V = \{m \in \psi_{F_\beta,b}.L | E_\beta^{(N)}m = 0, N >> 0\} = (\psi_{F_\beta,b}.L)^{[\beta]}$. By Proposition 2.3 this is a U_q-submodule of the U_q-module $\psi_{F_\beta,b}.L$. It is nonzero since $v' \in V$. By Lemma 5.18 V has a simple U_q-submodule L'.

We have left to show that $T_{L'} \subset T_L$. Assume $\gamma \in T_{L'}$. Then $q^{l\mathbb{N}\gamma} \operatorname{wt} L' \subset \operatorname{wt} L'$ by Proposition 3.7. But since $\operatorname{wt} L' \subset \{(\lambda^0, \lambda^1 - b\beta) | (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \operatorname{wt} L\}$ we get for some $\nu \in \operatorname{wt} L$, $\{(\nu^0, \nu^1 - b\beta + r\gamma) | r \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \{(\lambda^0, \lambda^1 - b\beta) | (\lambda^0, \lambda^1) \in \operatorname{wt} L\}$ or equivalently $q^{l\mathbb{N}\gamma}\nu \subset \operatorname{wt} L$. But this shows that $\gamma \notin F_L$ and since L is a simple U_q-module this implies that $\gamma \in T_L$. By construction we have $\beta \notin T_{L'}$. □

Lemma 5.22 *Let $L \in \mathcal{F}$ be a simple module. Then there exists a $w \in W$ such that $w(F_L \backslash F_L^s) \subset \Phi^+$ and $w(T_L \backslash T_L^s) \subset \Phi^-$.*

Proof. Lemma 4.16 in [Fer90] tells us that there exists a basis B of the root system Φ such that the antisymmetrical part, $F_L \backslash F_L^s$, of F_L is contained in the positive roots Φ_B^+ corresponding to the basis B and the antisymmetrical part, $T_L \backslash T_L^s$, of T_L is contained in the negative roots Φ_B^- corresponding to the basis. Since all bases of a root system are W-conjugate the claim follows. □

Lemma 5.23 *Let L be an infinite dimensional admissible simple module. Let $w \in W$ be such that $w(F_L \backslash F_L^s) \subset \Phi^+$. Let $\alpha \in \Pi$ be such that $-\alpha \in w(T_L)$ (such an α always exists). Then there exists a commuting set of roots Σ with $\alpha \in \Sigma$ which is a basis of Q such that $-\Sigma \subset w(T_L)$.*

Proof. Set $L' = {}^wL$. Since $w(T_L) = T_{{}^wL} = T_{L'}$ we will just work with L'. Then $F_{L'} \backslash F_{L'}^s \subset \Phi^+$.

Note that it is always possible to choose a simple root $\alpha \in -T_{L'}$ since L' is infinite dimensional: If this was not possible we would have $\Phi^- \subset F_{L'}$. But since $F_{L'} \backslash F_{L'}^s \subset \Phi^+$ this implies $F_{L'} = \Phi$.

Set $F = F_{L'}^s \cap \Pi$. Since L' is infinite dimensional $F \neq \Pi$. By Lemma 5.6 2. applied with $J = \{\alpha\} = \Sigma'$ there exists a commuting set of roots Σ that is a basis of Q such that $\Sigma \subset \Phi^+ \backslash \Phi_F^+$. Since $F_{L'} \backslash F_{L'}^s \subset \Phi^+$ we have $\Phi^- = T_{L'}^- \cup (F_{L'}^s)^-$. To show $-\Sigma \subset T_{L'}$ we show $\left(\Phi^- \backslash \Phi_F^-\right) \cap F_{L'}^s = \emptyset$ or equivalently $(F_{L'}^s)^- \subset \Phi_F^-$.

Assume $\beta \in F_{L'}^s \cap \Phi^+$, $\beta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} a_\alpha \alpha$, $a_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. The height of β is the sum $\sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} a_\alpha$. We will show by induction on the height of β that $-\beta \in \Phi_F^-$. If the height of β is 1 then β is a simple root and so $\beta \in F$. Clearly $-\beta \in \Phi_F^-$ in this case. Assume the height of β is greater than 1. Let $\alpha' \in \Pi$ be a simple root such that $\beta - \alpha'$ is a root. There are two possibilities: $-\alpha' \in T_{L'}$ or $\pm\alpha' \in F_{L'}^s$.

In the first case where $-\alpha' \in T_{L'}$ we must have $-\beta + \alpha' \in F_{L'}^s$ since if $-\beta + \alpha' \in T_L$ then $-\beta = (-\beta + \alpha') - \alpha' \in T_{L'}$ because $T_{L'}$ is closed (Proposition 3.8). So $\beta - \alpha' \in F_{L'}^s$ and $\beta \in F_{L'}^s$. Since $F_{L'}$ is closed (Proposition 2.11) we get $-\alpha' = (\beta - \alpha') - \beta \in F_L$ which is a contradiction. So the first case ($-\alpha' \in T_{L'}$) is impossible.

In the second case since $F_{L'}$ is closed we get $\pm(\beta - \alpha') \in F_{L'}$ i.e. $\beta - \alpha' \in F_{L'}^s$. By the induction $-(\beta - \alpha') \in \Phi_F^-$ and since $-\beta = -(\beta - \alpha') - \alpha'$ we are done. □

6 Coherent families

As in the above section q is a complex primitive l'th root of unity with l odd in this section. For $\lambda \in X$ we write $\lambda = (\lambda^0, \lambda^1)$ like above.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $M, N \in \mathcal{F}$ be semisimple U_q-modules. If $\operatorname{Tr}^M = \operatorname{Tr}^N$ then $M \cong N$.*

Proof. Theorem 7.19 in [Lam01] states that this is true for modules over a *finite dimensional* algebra. So we will reduce to the case of modules over a finite dimensional algebra. Let L be a composition factor of M and λ a weight of L. Then the multiplicity of the U_q-composition factor L in M is the multiplicity of the $(U_q)_0$-composition factor L_λ in M_λ by Theorem 2.21. M_λ is a finite dimensional $(U_q)_0$-module. Let I be the kernel of the homomorphism $(U_q)_0 \to \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(M_\lambda)$ given by the action of $(U_q)_0$. Then $(U_q)_0/I$ is a finite dimensional $\mathbb{C}$ algebra and M_λ is a module over $(U_q)_0/I$. Furthermore since $\operatorname{Tr}^M(\lambda, u) = 0$ for all $u \in I$ the trace of an element $u \in (U_q)_0$ is the same as the trace of $u + I \in (U_q)_0/I$ on M_λ as a $(U_q)_0/I$-module. So if $\operatorname{Tr}^M = \operatorname{Tr}^N$ the multiplicity of L_λ in M_λ and N_λ are the same and hence the multiplicity of L in M is the same as in N. $\square$

Definition 6.2

$$T^* = \mathfrak{h}^*/Q.$$

By Corollary 5.10 it makes sense to write $\psi_{F_\beta,t}.M$ for $t \in T^*$ up to isomorphism for a $U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$-module M.

Definition 6.3 *A (quantized) coherent family is a U_q-module $\mathcal{M}$ such that for all $\mu \in \Lambda_l$:*

- $\dim \mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} = \dim \mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu')}$ *for all* $\nu, \nu' \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.
- *For all $u \in (U_q)_0$, the map $\mathfrak{h}^* \ni \nu \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} u|_{\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}}$ is polynomial.*

For a coherent family $\mathcal{M}$ and $t \in T^*$ define

$$\mathcal{M}[t] = \bigoplus_{\mu^0 \in \Lambda_l, \mu^1 \in t} \mathcal{M}_{(\mu^0,\mu^1)}.$$

$\mathcal{M}$ is called irreducible if there exists a $t \in T^*$ such that $\mathcal{M}[t]$ is a simple U_q-module.

Lemma 6.4 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a coherent family. Let $\mu \in \Lambda_l$. Then the set Ω of all weights $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that the $(U_q)_0$-module $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ is simple is a Zariski open subset of $\mathfrak{h}^*$.*

If $\mathcal{M}$ is irreducible then $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ if $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} \neq 0$ for any $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (equivalently for all $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$).

Proof. If $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} = 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ then $\Omega = \emptyset$. Assume $\dim \mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} = d > 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is irreducible there exists $t \in T^*$ such that $\mathcal{M}[t]$ is a simple U_q-module. Then for $\nu \in t$, $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} = \mathcal{M}[t]_{(\mu,\nu)}$ is a simple U_q-module by Theorem 2.21. So in this case $\Omega \neq \emptyset$.

Now the proof goes exactly like in [Mat00, Lemma 4.7]: The $(U_q)_0$-module $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ is simple if and only if the bilinear map $B_\nu : (U_q)_0 \times (U_q)_0 \ni (u, v) \mapsto \operatorname{Tr}(uv|_{\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}})$ has maximal rank d^2. For any finite dimensional subspace $E \subset (U_q)_0$ the set Ω_E of all ν such that $B_\nu|_E$ has rank d^2 is open. Therefore $\Omega = \cup_E \Omega_E$ is open. $\square$

Definition 6.5 *Let L be an admissible U_q-module and let $\mu \in \Lambda_l$.*

$$\operatorname{Supp}(L,\mu) = \{\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^* \,|\, \dim L_{(\mu,\nu)} > 0\}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Supp}_{\mathrm{ess}}(L,\mu) = \{\nu \in \operatorname{Supp}(L,\mu) \,|\, \dim L_{(\mu,\nu)} \text{ is maximal in } \{\dim L_{(\mu,\nu')} | \nu' \in \mathfrak{h}^*\}\}.$$

Definition 6.6 *Let M be an admissible module. Define M^{ss} to be the unique (up to isomorphism) semisimple module with the same composition factors as M.*

Let V be a U_q-module such that $V = \bigoplus_{i \in I} V_i$ for some index set I and some admissible U_q-modules V_i. Then $V^{ss} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} V_i^{ss}$.

Proposition 6.7 *Let L be an infinite dimensional admissible simple U_q-module. Then there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) semisimple irreducible coherent family $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ containing L.*

Proof. Let $w \in W$ be such that $w(F_L \backslash F_L^s) \subset \Phi^+$ and Σ a set of commuting roots that is a basis of Q such that $-\Sigma \subset w(T_L)$ (Exists by Lemma 5.22 and Lemma 5.23) with corresponding Ore subset F_Σ. Set

$$\mathcal{EXT}(L) := \left(\bigoplus_{t \in T^*} {}^{\overline{w}}\left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,t}.({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma}\right) \right)^{ss}.$$

For each $t \in T^*$ choose a representative $\nu_t \in t$. As a $(U_{q(F_\Sigma)})_0$-module

$$\mathcal{EXT}(L) = \bigoplus_{t \in T^*} {}^{\overline{w}}\left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu_t}.({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma}\right)^{ss}.$$

Define $Y := \{\mu \in \Lambda_l | \operatorname{Supp}({}^{w}L,\mu) \neq \emptyset\}$. For each $\mu \in Y$ let $\lambda_\mu \in \operatorname{Supp}_{\mathrm{ess}}({}^{w}L,\mu)$. By Corollary 5.10

$$({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma} \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in Y} \bigoplus_{\nu \in Q} \psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}$$

as $(U_{q(F_\Sigma)})_0$-modules.

So we have the following $(U_{q(F_\Sigma)})_0$-module isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{EXT}(L) &\cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in Y} \bigoplus_{t \in T^*} \bigoplus_{\nu \in Q} {}^{\overline{w}}\left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu_t+\nu}.(({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}\right)^{ss} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in Y} \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*} {}^{\overline{w}}\left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^{w}L)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}\right)^{ss}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $u \in (U_q)_0$ and $\mu \in Y$. Then we see from the above and Lemma 5.19 that

$$\operatorname{Tr} u|_{\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}} = \operatorname{Tr} \psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu-\lambda_\mu}^{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}(T_w^{-1}(u))|_{({}^{w}L)_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}}.$$

By Lemma 5.2 this is polynomial in $\nu - \lambda_\mu$ hence also polynomial in ν. We know that this polynomial is determined in all ν such that $\nu - \lambda_\mu \in \operatorname{Supp}_{\mathrm{ess}}(L,\mu)$. $\operatorname{Supp}_{\mathrm{ess}}(L,\mu)$ is Zariski dense in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ because $\lambda_\mu - \mathbb{N}\Sigma \subset \operatorname{Supp}_{\mathrm{ess}}(L,\mu)$ and Σ is a basis of Q. So Tr is determined on all of $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ by L. For any $(\mu,\nu)\in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu+\nu)} &= \dim\left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}\right)^{ss}\\ &= \dim(({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}\end{aligned}$$

so $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ is a coherent family.

Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a semisimple irreducible coherent family containing L. Let $\mu\in Y$. By Lemma 6.4 the set Ω_1 of $\nu\in\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}$ is simple and the set Ω_2 of $\nu\in\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ is simple are non-empty open subsets of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ ($\Omega_1\neq\emptyset$ because $\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}=L_{(\mu,\nu)}$ for $\nu\in\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$). So their intersection $\Omega_1\cap\Omega_2$ is open and non-empty (since any Zariski open set of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ is Zariski dense in $\mathfrak{h}^*$). Since $\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$ is Zariski dense we get that there exists a $\nu\in\Omega_1\cap\Omega_2\cap\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ and $\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}$ are simple. Since $L_{(\mu,\nu)}\subset\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ and $L_{(\mu,\nu)}\subset\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}$ we get $\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}\cong L_{(\mu,\nu)}\cong\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}$. This is true for any (μ,ν) such that $\nu\in\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$. Let $u\in(U_q)_0$ and $\mu\in Y$. Then we see that $\operatorname{Tr}u|_{\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}}=\operatorname{Tr}u|_{L_{(\mu,\nu)}}=\operatorname{Tr}u|_{\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}}$ for any $\nu\in\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$. Since $\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L,\mu)$ is Zariski dense this implies $\operatorname{Tr}u|_{\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}}=\operatorname{Tr}u|_{\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}}$ for all $\nu\in\mathfrak{h}^*$. So by Lemma 6.1 $\mathcal{EXT}(L)_{(\mu,\nu)}\cong\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}$ as $(U_q)_0$-modules for any $(\mu,\nu)\in\operatorname{wt}\mathcal{EXT}(L)$.

Then by Theorem 2.21 we get that $\mathcal{M}\cong\mathcal{EXT}(L)\oplus\mathcal{N}$ for some coherent family $\mathcal{N}$ with the property that $\mathcal{N}_{(\mu,\nu)}=0$ for any $(\mu,\nu)\in X$ such that $\operatorname{Supp}(L,\mu)\neq\emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is irreducible there exists a $t\in T^*$ such that the U_q-module $\mathcal{M}[t]$ is simple. We have $\mathcal{M}[t]\cong\mathcal{EXT}(L)[t]\oplus\mathcal{N}[t]$. Since $\mathcal{M}[t]$ is simple and $\mathcal{EXT}(L)[t]\neq 0$ we get that $\mathcal{N}[t]=0$. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is a coherent family this implies that $\mathcal{N}=0$. So $\mathcal{M}\cong\mathcal{EXT}(L)$.

So we have left to show that $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ is irreducible. Let $F_{\beta_1},\dots,F_{\beta_n}$ be the root vectors corresponding to $\Sigma=\{\beta_1,\dots,\beta_n\}$ and $E_{\beta_1},\dots,E_{\beta_n}$ the corresponding E-root vectors. Let $\mu\in Y$. As above we choose a $\lambda_\mu\in\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}({}^wL)$. The elements $F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}E_{\beta_i}^{(l)}$, $i=1,\dots,n$ act on $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}$ by $\sum_{j=1}^s p_{i,j}^\mu(\nu)u_{i,j}$ for some $u_{i,j}^\mu\in U_{q(F_\Sigma)}$ and some polynomials $p_{i,j}^\mu:\mathfrak{h}^*\to\mathbb{C}$ so

$$p_\mu:=\prod_{i=1}^n\det F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}E_{\beta_i}^{(l)}|_{\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu)}}$$

is a nonzero polynomial in ν by (the proof of) Lemma 5.2. Set $p=\prod_{\mu\in Y}p_\mu$. Let Ω be the set of non-zero points for p. By [Mat00, Lemma 5.2 i)] the set $T(\Omega):=\bigcap_{\mu\in Q}(\mu+\Omega)$ is non-empty. So there exists a $\nu\in\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $p(\nu+\mu^1)\neq 0$ for any $\mu^1\in Q$. For such a ν we see that $F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}E_{\beta_i}^{(l)}$ act bijectively on

$$\bigoplus_{\mu\in Y}\bigoplus_{\mu^1\in Q}\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.(({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\lambda_\mu+\mu^1)}=\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma}.$$

Since $F_{\beta_i}^{(l)}$ act injectively on $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma}$ this implies that $E_{\beta_i}^{(l)}$ act injectively on $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma}$. Let $L_1\subset\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma}$ be a simple U_q-submodule of $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma}$. By the above we have $\pm\Sigma\subset T_{L_1}$. So by Proposition 3.7 we get $T_{L_1}=\Phi$. Define $\mathcal{EXT}(L_1)=\left(\bigoplus_{t\in T^*}(\psi_{F_\Sigma,t}.(L_1)_{F_\Sigma})\right)^{ss}$. Then as above this is a coherent family. Let $\lambda'\in\operatorname{wt}L_1$. Then $\mathcal{EXT}[\lambda'+Q]=(L_1)_{F_\Sigma}=L_1$ by Lemma 5.19 so $\mathcal{EXT}(L_1)$ is an irreducible coherent family.

Let $\mu \in \Lambda_l$ be such that $\operatorname{Supp}(L_1,\mu) \neq \emptyset$. $\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L_1,\mu)$ is Zariski dense in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ so $\operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L_1,\mu) \cap \Omega_1 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\nu' \in \Omega_1 \cap \operatorname{Supp}_{\text{ess}}(L_1,\mu)$. Then $(L_1)_{(\mu,\nu')} \cong (\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma})_{(\mu,\nu')}$. Then as above (with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{EXT}(L)$ and L replaced by L_1) we get $\mathcal{EXT}(L) \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L_1) \oplus \mathcal{N}$ for some semisimple coherent family $\mathcal{N}$ with $\mathcal{N}_{(\mu,\nu)} = 0$ for any $(\mu,\nu) \in X$ such that $\operatorname{Supp}(L_1,\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ contains L we get that $L = M' \oplus M''$ for some U_q-modules $M' \subset \mathcal{EXT}(L_1)$ and $M'' \subset \mathcal{N}$. Since L is simple and since there exists a $\mu \in \Lambda_l$ such that $\operatorname{Supp}(L,\mu) \neq \emptyset$ and $\operatorname{Supp}(L_1,\mu) \neq \emptyset$ we must have $M'' = 0$ and $L = M'$. But then we have proved that the irreducible coherent family $\mathcal{EXT}(L_1)$ contains L. Hence $\mathcal{EXT}(L) \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L_1)$ by the above and $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ is irreducible. $\square$

Theorem 6.8 *Let L be an admissible infinite dimensional simple module. Then there exists a $w \in W$ and a $\lambda \in X$ such that ${}^w\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ contains an infinite dimensional simple highest weight module $L(\lambda)$ and ${}^w\mathcal{EXT}(L) \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda))$.*

Proof. Let $w \in W$ be such that $w(F_L \backslash F_L^s) \subset \Phi^+$ and $w(T_L \backslash T_L^s) \subset \Phi^-$ and let Σ be a set of commuting roots that is a basis of Q such that $-\Sigma \subset w(T_L)$ (Exists by Lemma 5.22 and Lemma 5.23). Let F_Σ be a corresponding Ore subset. Then

$$\mathcal{EXT}(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{t \in T^*} {}^{\overline{w}} \left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,t}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma} \right) \right)^{ss}$$

so

$${}^w\mathcal{EXT}(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{t \in T^*} \left(\psi_{F_\Sigma,t}.({}^wL)_{F_\Sigma} \right) \right)^{ss} = \mathcal{EXT}({}^wL).$$

Set $L' = {}^wL$. We will show by induction on $|T^+_{L'}|$ that there exists a $\lambda \in X$ such that $L(\lambda)$ is infinite dimensional and $\mathcal{EXT}(L') \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda))$:

If $|T^+_{L'}| = 0$ then L' is itself an infinite dimensional highest weight module. Assume $|T^+_{L'}| > 0$. Then $T^+_{L'} \cap \Pi \neq \emptyset$ because if this was not the case then $\Phi^+ \subset F_{L'}$ since $F_{L'}$ is closed. But $\Phi^+ \subset F_{L'}$ implies $|T^+_{L'}| = 0$.

Let $\alpha \in T^+_{L'} \cap \Pi$. Then $\alpha \in T^s_{L'}$ since $T_{L'} \backslash T^s_{L'} \subset \Phi^-$. So $-\alpha \in T_{L'}$. Then by Lemma 5.21 there exists a $b \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\psi_{F_\alpha,b}.L'_{F_\alpha}$ contains a simple U_q-submodule L'' with $T_{L''} \subset T_{L'}$ and $\alpha \notin T_{L''}$. By Lemma 5.23 there exists a set of commuting roots Σ that is a basis of Q such that $\alpha \in \Sigma$ and $-\Sigma \subset T_{L'}$. Then by the above there exists a $\nu = b\alpha$ such that $\psi_{F_\Sigma,\nu}.L'_{F_\Sigma}$ contains a simple U_q-submodule L'' with $T_{L''} \subset T_{L'}$ and $\alpha \notin T_{L''}$. L'' is infinite dimensional since $-\Sigma \subset T_{L''}$ and $\mathcal{EXT}(L'') \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L')$ by Proposition 6.7.

By induction there exists a $\lambda \in X$ such that $L(\lambda)$ is infinite dimensional and $\mathcal{EXT}(L'') \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda))$. $\square$

The twists we have defined for quantum group modules are analogues of the twists that can be made of normal Lie algebra modules as described in [Mat00]. In the next proposition we will use these Lie algebra module twists denoted by f^ν_Σ given a set of commuting roots Σ and a $\nu \in T^*$ (see Section 4 in [Mat00]). For $\lambda^1 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ let $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)$ denote the simple highest weight Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$-module with highest weight λ^1. Let e_β, f_β denote root vectors in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $[e_\beta, f_\beta] = h_\beta$.

Proposition 6.9 *Let* $\lambda^1 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *be such that* $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)$ *is admissible. Let* Σ *be a set of commuting roots that is a basis of* Q *with* f_β *acting injectively on* $L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)$ *for each* $\beta \in \Sigma$*. Let* $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda_l$*. Define* $\mathcal{M} = \left(\bigoplus_{\nu \in T^*} f_\Sigma^\nu . L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)_{f_\Sigma}\right)^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))$*. Then* $\mathcal{M}$ *is an irreducible coherent family containing the simple highest weight module* $L((\lambda^0, \lambda^1))$*.*

Proof. $\mathcal{M}$ contains $L((\lambda^0, \lambda^1))$ by Proposition 5.17.

Set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus_{\nu \in T^*} f_\Sigma^\nu . L_{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda^1)_{f_\Sigma}$. So $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda_l$ and $u \in (U_q)_0$. We need to show that the map $\nu \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} u|_{\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)}}$ is polynomial.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{(\mu,\nu)} =& \bigoplus_{\eta \in \Lambda} \left((\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})^{[l]}\right)_{q^\eta(0,\nu)} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))_{q^{-\eta}(\mu,0)} \\
=& \bigoplus_{\eta \in l\Lambda} \left((\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})_{\nu + \frac{\eta}{l}}\right)^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))_{q^{-\eta}(\mu,0)} \\
=& \bigoplus_{\eta \in l\Lambda} \left(f_\Sigma^{\nu + \frac{\eta}{l}} . (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})_0\right)^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))_{q^{-\eta}(\mu,0)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The action on $(f_\Sigma^\nu . (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})_0)^{[l]} \otimes L(\lambda^0)$ is just the action on $((\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}})_0)^{[l]} \otimes L(\lambda^0)$ twisted with the automorphism $u' \mapsto f_\Sigma^\nu u' f_\Sigma^{-\nu}$ on the first tensor factor where $u' = \operatorname{Fr}(u)$ (Fr is the Frobenius twist defined in [KL02, Theorem 1.1]). The map $u' \mapsto f_\Sigma^\nu u' f_\Sigma^{-\nu}$ is of the form $\sum_i p_i(\nu) u_i$ for some polynomials p_i and some $u_i \in (U_{\mathbb{C}})_0$ where $U_{\mathbb{C}} := U(\mathfrak{g})$ is the classical universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Composing a polynomial map with the map $\lambda \mapsto \lambda + \frac{\eta}{l}$ is still polynomial. So the trace is a finite sum of polynomials in λ which is still polynomial.

Let u_q be the small quantum group as defined in [AM15] i.e. the subalgebra of U_q generated by $E_\alpha, K_\alpha^{\pm 1}, F_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Pi$. Then $L((\lambda^0, 0))$ restricted to u_q is a simple u_q-module by [AM15, Section 3.2].

By [Mat00, Lemma 5.3 i)] and [Mat00, Proposition 5.4] there exists a $t \in T^*$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}}[t]$ is simple. Then $\mathcal{M}[t] = (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}}[t])^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))$ is simple: Let $0 \neq v_0 \otimes v_1 \in L((\lambda^0, 0)) \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}}[t])^{[l]}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_q(v_0 \otimes v_1) =& U_q u_q (v_0 \otimes v_1) \\
=& U_q (L((\lambda^0, 0)) \otimes v_1) \\
=& L((\lambda^0, 0)) \otimes U_q v_1 \\
=& L((\lambda^0, 0)) \otimes (U_{\mathbb{C}} v_1)^{[l]} \\
=& L((\lambda^0, 0)) \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}}[t])^{[l]}
\end{aligned}
$$

since $L((\lambda^0, 0))$ is a simple u_q-module and since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{C}}[t]$ is a simple $U_{\mathbb{C}}$-module.□

Corollary 6.10 $\left(\bigoplus_{\nu \in T^*} \left(f_\Sigma^\nu . L(\lambda^1)_{f_\Sigma}\right)^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))\right)^{ss} \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L((\lambda^0, \lambda^1)))$.

Proof. This follows by the uniqueness of $\mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda))$. □

Corollary 6.11 *Let* L *be an infinite dimensional admissible simple module. Then* $\mathcal{EXT}(L)$ *is of the form* $\left((\mathcal{M})^{[l]} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))\right)^{ss}$ *for some* $\mathfrak{g}$ *coherent family* $\mathcal{M}$ *(in the sense of [Mat00]).*

Proof. By Theorem 6.8 there exists a $w \in W$ and a $\lambda \in X$ such that ${}^{w}\mathcal{EXT}(L) \cong \mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda))$. By Corollary 6.10 $\mathcal{EXT}(L(\lambda)) \cong \left(\mathcal{M} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))\right)^{ss}$ for some $\mathfrak{g}$ coherent family $\mathcal{M}$. By [Mat00, Proposition 6.2] and the fact that $L((\lambda^0, 0))$ is finite dimensional we see that ${}^{w}\left(\mathcal{M} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))\right)^{ss} \cong \left(\mathcal{M} \otimes L((\lambda^0, 0))\right)^{ss}$ for all $w \in W$. □

So in the root of unity case the classification of torsion free modules reduces to the classification of classical torsion free modules. By Proposition 6.7 a torsion free module is a submodule of a semisimple irreducible coherent family so the problem reduces to classifying semisimple irreducible coherent families. By Corollary 6.11 the classification of these coherent families reduces to the classification in the classical case.

References

[AM15] Henning Haahr Andersen and Volodymyr Mazorchuk, *Category $\mathcal{O}$ for quantum groups*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **17** (2015), no. 2, 405–431. MR 3317747

[ANT44] Emil Artin, Cecil J. Nesbitt, and Robert M. Thrall, *Rings with Minimum Condition*, University of Michigan Publications in Mathematics, no. 1, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1944. MR 0010543 (6,33e)

[Fer90] S. L. Fernando, *Lie algebra modules with finite-dimensional weight spaces. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **322** (1990), no. 2, 757–781. MR 1013330 (91c:17006)

[Jan96] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Lectures on quantum groups*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 6, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. MR 1359532 (96m:17029)

[KL02] Shrawan Kumar and Peter Littelmann, *Algebraization of Frobenius splitting via quantum groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **155** (2002), no. 2, 491–551. MR 1906594 (2003e:20048)

[Lam01] T. Y. Lam, *A first course in noncommutative rings*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 131, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. MR 1838439 (2002c:16001)

[Lem69] F. W. Lemire, *Weight spaces and irreducible representations of simple Lie algebras.*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (1969), 192–197. MR 0243001 (39 #4326)

[LS91] Serge Levendorskiĭ and Yan Soibelman, *Algebras of functions on compact quantum groups, Schubert cells and quantum tori*, Comm. Math. Phys. **139** (1991), no. 1, 141–170. MR 1116413 (92h:58020)

[Lus90] George Lusztig, *Quantum groups at roots of* 1, Geom. Dedicata **35** (1990), no. 1-3, 89–113. MR 1066560 (91j:17018)

[Mat00] Olivier Mathieu, *Classification of irreducible weight modules*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **50** (2000), no. 2, 537–592. MR 1775361 (2001h:17017)

[Pap94] Paolo Papi, *A characterization of a special ordering in a root system*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **120** (1994), no. 3, 661–665. MR 1169886 (94e:20056)

[Ped15a] Dennis Hasselstrøm Pedersen, *Irreducible quantum group modules with finite dimensional weight spaces. II*, arXiv:1506.08011, 2015.

[Ped15b] ———, *Twisting functors for quantum group modules*, arXiv:1504.07039, 2015.

[Pul06] Riccardo Pulcini, *Degree of parabolic quantum groups*, arXiv:math/0606337, June 2006.